

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10102 of 2001

-
-
1. Gopi Kant Chaudhary, S/o Gangadhar Chaudhary, Producer, S.I.E.T., (S.C.E.R.T. Campus), Mahendru, Patna-6.
 2. Subhash Chandra Jha, s/o Pandit Surya Narayan Jha, Lecturer, S.I.E.T. (S.C.E.R.T. Campus), Mahendru, Patna-6.
 3. Ranjan Sinha, S/o Sri Bipin Bihari Sinha, S.I.E.T. (S.C.E.R.T. Campus), Mahendru, Patna-6.
 4. Anil Kumar, S/o Late Mannu Ram, Producer, S.I.E.T. (S.C.E.R.T. Campus), Mahendru, Patna-6.
 5. Sanjeev Kumar Sinha, S/o Sri Awadhesh Kumar, Lecturer (Production), S.I.E.T. (S.C.E.R.T. Campus), Mahendru, Patna-6.
 6. Satyendra Kumar, S/o Sri Ram Awtar Prasad, S.I.E.T. (S.C.E.R.T. Campus), Mahendru, Patna-6.
 7. Anil Kumar Sinha, Son of _____, S.I.E.T. (S.C.E.R.T. Campus), Mahendru, Patna-6.
 8. Kumari Lalita, D/o Sri Nagendra Kumar, S.I.E.T. (S.C.E.R.T. Campus), Mahendru, Patna-6.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Secretary, Secondary, Primary & Adult Education, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Director, State Institute of Education Technology, S.E.R.T. Campus, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ravi Shankar Ganguli
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. (SC9)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 15-03-2018

No one appears for the petitioners. Counsel for the State is present. On 8.3.2018 also, counsel for the petitioners was absent but counsel for the State was present.

In the present case, the only dispute has been raised with regard to entitlement of benefit arising from G.P.F. scheme in place of E.P.F. scheme as has been claimed that earlier the petitioners were extended the benefit arising from G.P.F. scheme but, all on a sudden, vide order order no. 256 dated 5.9.2000, it was informed



by the respondent no.3 that the scheme of E.P.F. is to be implemented and the petitioners will fall under the scheme of E.P.F. from September, 2000.

Only the dispute is that whether the petitioners will fall under the G.P.F. scheme or they will be compelled to switch over to the E.P.F. scheme. The G.P.F. scheme and E.P.F. scheme functions in a different manner and have different concepts of applicability.

In the counter affidavit, it has been stated that the petitioners were wrongly given the benefit of G.P.F. scheme and, later on, when it was transpired that the petitioners were wrongly been given the benefit of G.P.F. scheme, only the rectification has been done and the petitioners have been brought to the proper scheme of E.P.F.

This Court does not find any reason to interfere with the decision taken by the Government which has been communicated through office order no. 256 dated 5.9.2000 (Annexure-1).

Accordingly, this writ application is dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

rishi/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	19.03.2018
Transmission Date	Na

