

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 549 of 2015

=====

Nand Lal Singh Son of Late Chanardeep Singh resident of village -
Mahadeo, Police Station - Sahiyara, District - Sitamarhi

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Health,
Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Health, Government of Bihar,
Patna
3. The Joint Secretary, Department of Health, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. The Director (Indigenous Medicines), Directorate Indigenous
Medicines, Government of Bihar, Patna
5. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi, Bihar
6. The District Indigenous Medicines Officer, Sitamarhi, Bihar

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. N.H.Khan, SC-1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3. 20-01-2017 Heard Sri Ajay Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner as well as Mr. N.H.Khan, learned Standing Counsel – 1.

The petitioner has approached this Court with a prayer
to quash an order dated 05-08-2014, whereby salary of
officer/staff, including the petitioner, of the District Indigenous
Medicine Office and District Joint Dispensary, Sitamarhi was
stopped. Further prayer has been made for directing to release the
current salary also.

In this case, a counter affidavit has been filed and it
has been indicated that in view of question raised in the Bihar



Legislative Assembly, relating to closure of the centre, the decision was taken to stop the salary, however; subsequently during enquiry, a decision was taken to release the salary.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the fact that subsequently salary has been paid and petitioner is getting salary, but still he raises an objection that due to the reason that for some period his salary was stopped, he had suffered a lot.

However; in the writ petition, save & except the prayer for releasing the salary and quashing of order, no other prayer for payment of interest has been made and as such, in absence of any pleading, no order can be passed.

In view of the fact that grievance of the petitioner made in the writ petition has already been redressed, there is no reason to keep the matter pending.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

U			
---	--	--	--

