

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20060 of 2014

=====

Smt. Sanjukta Devi, W/o Late Ram Chausha Prasad, Resident of South Mansarwa Paar, Pant Nagar (Ghuri Tand Bypass Bodh Gaya Road), Road No.-2 P.O.- Chand Chaura, P.S.- Magadh Medical College, District-Gaya.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Directorate of Health, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Director, Directorate of Integrated Child Development Service, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
7. The District Magistrate, Gaya.
8. The District Programme Officer, Gaya.
9. The Child Development Programme Officer, Sherghati, Gaya.
10. The Civil Surgeon, Manpur, Vajirganj, Gaya.
11. The Accountant General, Veer Chand Patel Marg, Bihar, Patna.
12. The Treasury Officer, Shergahati, Gaya.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anjani Kumar Sharan, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. AC to PAAG-II
Mr. Vivekanand Kumar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

14 11-01-2017 Heard Sri Anjani Kumar Sharan, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned AC to Principal Addl. Additional Advocate General No.II as well as Sri Vivekanand Kumar, learned counsel for the Respondent/Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.

The present writ petition was filed with a prayer to direct the Respondents to pay post retiral dues including pension, gratuity, leave encashment and other admissible dues.



In the writ petition, by order dated 05.02.2016, this Court had directed to pay retiral dues within specified and the case was directed to be listed after four months. In this case, thereafter, number of affidavits have been filed on behalf of the Respondents to show that grievances of the petitioner have already been redressed. However, Sri Sharan, learned counsel for the petitioner tried to persuade the Court that despite specific direction of this Court vide order dated 05.02.2016, the Respondents did not pay the exact interest amount on delayed payment, whereas learned counsel for the State submits that 12 % interest amount on delayed payment has already been made. Besides this, it has been indicated that the amount of gratuity was also paid and the petitioner is getting pension and arrear amount of pension has already been paid.

Keeping in view the fact that the relief, which was sought for in the writ petition, has already been granted to the petitioner, there is no reason to keep the matter pending.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

NKS/-

U			
---	--	--	--

