

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3684 of 2018

=====

Satya Narain Patel, Son of Late Dhanushdhari Patel, Resident of Mohalla-
Malighat, P.S.-Mithanpura, District-Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, H.R.D., Government of Bihar,
New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Vice-Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar, Bihar University,
Muzaffarpur.
3. The Registrar, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
4. The F.O., Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar, Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
5. The S.O., Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar, Bihar, University, Muzaffarpur.
6. The Deputy Librarian, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar, Bihar, University,
Muzaffarpur.
7. The Press Superintendant of Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar, Bihar University,
Muzaffarpur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 09-08-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner; State and
B.R.A. Bihar University.

2. The petitioner has moved the Court for the following
reliefs:

*“That this is an application for issuance of
writ in the Mandamus or an appropriate writ for
fixation and grant of pension, Gratuity, G.P.F. and*



unutilized Leave Encasement and other admissible retirement benefit for which the petitioner is legally entitled with the interest at the rate of 12% per annum and also to direct the respondents to pay full group insurance and provident fund to the petitioner, which has illegally not paid as yet and/or for issuance of and appropriate writ/s, order/s or direction/s for which the petitioner is found legally entitled.”

3. From the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the University, it transpires that all admitted retiral dues of the petitioner have been paid.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the same has wrongly been made from the year 2011, though it should have been from the year 2005. The Court finds such contention to be misconceived. In the writ petition itself, by way of Annexure-5, the petitioner has brought on record the order of the University which clearly shows that the date of appointment of the petitioner is 01.03.2011 and the date of confirmation is also 01.03.2011. Till the time the said order is in operation, the payment made by the University cannot be faulted. The Court would only note here that there is no challenge to the date of appointment/confirmation of the petitioner. This being the position, without there being any variation in the date of appointment/confirmation, the payment made by the University appears to be correct and proper.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed off.



6. However, disposal of the present writ petition shall not preclude the petitioner from moving before the appropriate forum, in accordance with law, with regard to his any remaining grievance.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	

