

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7898 of 2014

=====

1. Pairu Rajak son of Late Daru Rajak resident of village - Tilakpur, P.S. - Belhar, District - Banka.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Water Resources Department, Sinchai Bhawan, Patna.
2. The Director, Provident Fund Directorate, Pant Bhawan, Patna.
3. The District Provident Fund Officer - Rohtas at Sasaram.
4. The Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department, Dehri, District - Rohtas.
5. The Superintending Engineer, Sone Modernization Circle, Dehri, District - Rohtas.
6. The Executive Engineer, Sone Barrage Division, Indrapuri, District - Rohtas.
7. The General Manager, (Pension Cell), State Bank of India, Judges Road, Patna.
8. The Manager, State Bank of India, Indrapuri Branch (Branch Code no. - 8182) District - Rohtas.
9. The District Magistrate, (Pension cell), Rohtas.
10. The Accountant General, Bihar, Beerchand Patel Path, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar
For the State : Mr. Jay Prakash Sharma, A.C. to GP-21
For Accountant General : Mr. Uday Kumar, Adv.
For State Bank of India : Mr. Ramesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 07-03-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State, learned counsel for the Accountant General and learned counsel for the Bank.

2. The petitioner retired on 31st January, 2008 from the post of Pump Operator. Earlier, he was working in Work Charged Establishment. Subsequently, he was absorbed in regular establishment.

3. In the instant writ application, several grievances have



been raised in respect of payment of retiral dues.

4. Separate counter affidavits have been filed on behalf of the respondent no.3, respondent no.6 and respondent no.10.

5. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that during pendency of the writ application payments have been made to the petitioner under different heads but the interest over the delayed payment has wrongly been calculated.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submitted that on the basis of the application filed by the petitioner and on the basis of available documents, calculation was made and all the retiral benefits of the petitioner have been paid to him with admissible statutory interest.

7. Regard being had to the submissions recorded hereinabove, since there is no dispute to the fact that retiral benefits of the petitioner have already been paid and the dispute remains only in respect of calculation of interest, the writ application is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the civil court of competent jurisdiction for redressal of any of his disputed claim.

(Ashwani Kumar Singh, J)

Pradeep/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	08-03-2017
Transmission Date	

