

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17142 of 2016

=====

Raju Kumar, son of late Bachu Singh @ Bachu Sao, resident of village- Tekari
Deodharpur near Tekari Road High School, P.S.- Tekari, District- Gaya.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Health Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Superintendent, Prabhawati Hopital, Gaya.
3. Savitri Devi, wife of late Bachu Singh @ Bachu Sao, resident of village- Tekari
Deodharpur near Tekari Road High School, P.S.- Tekari, District- Gaya.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the State : Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh No.1, AC to SC-18

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 20-07-2018

Nobody appears on behalf of the petitioner. Learned
counsel for the State has assisted the Court.

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

“ A. For quashing the office order vide
memo no.1327 dated 30.11.2015 issued by the
respondent no.2, Superintendent, Prabhawati
Hospital, Gaya as contained in Annexure- 3 by
which the petitioner has been directed for payment
of amount relating to group insurance scheme,
salary, G.P.F., provisional pension and gratuity etc.
in favour of respondent no.3 Savitri Devi who is
step-mother of petitioner as per order passed on



05.06.2015 by the learned 9th Additional District Judge, Gaya in Succession Certificate Case No. 3/14/21/91.

B. Also for directing the respondents not to give effect of the order dated 30.11.2015 passed by the respondent no.2, Superintendent, Prabhawati Hospital, Gaya in the light of the order dated 05.06.2015 passed by the learned 9th Additional District Judge, Gaya in Succession Certificate Case No. 3/14/21/91 as contained in Annexure-1.

C. Also for directing the respondents not to disturb the petitioner in any manner.

D. And also for any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is found entitled in the eye of law.”

3. Learned counsel for the State submitted that he has filed counter affidavit on behalf of the respondents no.2 and 3. It was submitted that as per the order passed by the Civil Court in the succession case, the petitioner was to be given compassionate appointment and has given the other retiral benefits, which has been done by the authorities, but the petitioner has moved the Court praying that all payments should also be made to him. It was submitted that the authorities have acted in terms of the judgment passed in the succession case.

4. Having regard to the aforesaid, the Court does not



find any merit in the writ petition and, accordingly, the same stands dismissed.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J)

N.H./-

AFR/NAFR	
U	

