

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 13121 of 2014

=====

Mukund Kumar Jha, Son of Late Kaushlendra Jha, resident of Village -
Singheshwar, P.O. + P.S. - Singheshwar in the District of Madhepura.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Kameshwar Singh Sanskrit University, Darbhanga through its Registrar.
2. The Vice-Chancellor, Kameshwar Singh Sanskrit University, Darbhanga.
3. The Registrar, Kameshwar Singh Sanskrit University, Darbhanga.
4. The Finance Officer, Kameshwar Singh Sanskrit University, Darbhanga.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 08-12-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Kameshwar
Singh Sanskrit University, Darbhanga.

2. The petitioner has moved the Court for refund of Rs.
41,380/-, which has been adjusted from the gratuity payable to his
father.

3. This is the third round of litigation as earlier the
mother of the petitioner has twice moved the Court for the same
relief in C.W.J.C. No. 16634 of 2009 and C.W.J.C. No. 2221 of
2014. In the first round, liberty was given to file representation
which the petitioner's mother filed and the authorities came out with
an order dated 08.02.2014, explaining the adjustment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that



before making any adjustment from the gratuity, at least, show cause was required to be issued.

5. Having considered the matter, the Court cannot accept the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner for the reason that twice after the adjustment has been made, the matter came before this Court and the Court gave indulgence to file a representation before the authorities. The same having been done, an order has been passed which gives the break-up of the adjustment made. From the materials on record, the Court is convinced that such amount adjusted is the actual amount and there is no discrepancy and is also borne out from the various official communications, copies of which have been brought on record by the petitioner himself.

6. In view thereof, the Court finds no reason to interfere in the matter and, accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	

