

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2005 of 2016

In

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 224 of 2015

=====

Tej Narayan Singh, son of late R.N. Singh, resident of Mohalla Harnichak,
Police Station- Beur, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through the Chief Secretary, Bihar, Patna.
2. Mr. Amir Suhani, father's name not known to the petitioner, the Principal Secretary, Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna, through its Secretary, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. Mr Alok Kumar Sinha, father's name not known to the petitioner, the Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. Mr. P.K. Sinha, father's name not known to the petitioner, the Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna.
6. S. J. Kunwar, the Joint Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission-cum-Conducting Officer, Bailey Road, Patna.
7. Shamim Ahmed, Section Officer Establishment, Bihar Public Service Commission cum Presenting Officer, Bailey Road, Patna.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Niraj Kumar, AC to GA-10
For the B.P.S.C. : Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH

ORAL ORDER

4 17-05-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the opposite parties.

A show-cause has been filed on behalf of the Bihar Public Service Commission stating that the order of this Court has been fully complied with. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been paid 90% of his retiral benefits on the revised pay scale and 10% of the dues have been withheld, as criminal



cases are continuing against him.

Counsel for the petitioner disputes the submission of the learned counsel appearing for B.P.S.C. that he has been paid the retiral benefits of the petitioner on the basis of 6th Pay Revision. He submits that petitioner has been paid the retiral benefits on the basis of the scale, he was drawing salary in 2004, and not on the basis of revised pay scale.

In my view, the dispute raised by the petitioner cannot be a subject matter of this contempt application. If the petitioner is aggrieved, he may file a representation before the B.P.S.C. or to take resort of any other remedy available under law.

The contempt application stands disposed of.

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J)

Uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--

