

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.675 of 2014

Arising out of

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 6248 of 2006

- =====
1. The Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd. through the Managing Director, Sone Bhawan, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna
 2. The Managing Director, Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Sone Bhawan, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna
 3. The Chief of Finance, Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Sone Bhawan, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna
 4. The Chief of Claim, Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Sone Bhawan, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna
 5. The District Manager, Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Siwan

.... Respondents / Appellants

Versus

1. Subodh Prasad Son of Late Shridhar Prasad Resident of Village - Barhauria, P.S. Tarapur, District - Munger, at Present residing at A/2, Bankmen's Colony, Kankarbag, Patna – 20
2. The Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner, Muzaffarpur

.... Respondents / Respondents

=====

Appearance:

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Anjani Kumar, Sr. Advocate and
Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA)

Date: 02-03-2017

The challenge in the present Letters Patent Appeal is to an order dated 21.11.2013 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in CWJC No. 6248 of 2006, whereby the appellants were directed to settle all the outstanding dues including the arrears of salary, pension etc. within a period of three months after adjusting a sum of Rs. 21,382.79 as offered by the writ applicant himself.



2. We do not find any error in the order passed by the learned Single Bench as the writ applicant is entitled to all the retiral benefits after adjusting the outstanding amount. The grievance of the appellants is the claim of interest on the outstanding dues. The appellants do not have any contract to claim interest and, that too, 18% on the outstanding amount payable by the employee.

3. In view of the said facts, we do not find any merit in the present Letters Patent Appeal. The same is dismissed.

(Hemant Gupta, ACJ)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

Dilip/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	02.03.2017
Transmission Date	

