

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 1961 of 2011**

Hari Govind Mishra, S/o. Late Shri Ramnath Mishra, Aged about 63 years, Retd. Agriculture Development Officer (Soil Conservation), R/o. Ganga Nagar Ward, Geedam Road, Jagdalpur, District Bastar Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Agriculture Department, Mantralaya, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Assistant Soil Conservation Officer, Dharampura No.1, Jagdalpur, District Bastar Chhattisgarh
3. The Accountant General, Chhattisgarh, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Harshal Chouhan, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Lav Sharma, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No.3	:	Mr. Rajkumar Gupta, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****22/03/2018**

1. The present petition has been filed in respect of the non-payment of the retiral dues to the petitioner.
2. The counsel for the petitioner submits that respondents had illegally withheld an amount of Rs.51,317/- payable to the petitioner and thus prayed for a suitable direction.
3. The State counsel as well as the counsel appearing for the office of the Accountant General enters appearance and submits that subsequent to the disposal of the writ petition in the earlier round i.e. WPS No. 6835/2009 dated 23.11.2009, the case of the petitioner was scrutinized by the department and after recalculation, an amount of Rs.35,964/- has been paid to the petitioner on two installments.

4. Further, the petitioner vide his rejoinder has submitted a detailed chart showing the deposit and withdrawal that he has made periodically as is reflected in his service book. Likewise, the office of the Accountant General has also produced a document Annex. R/1 which has been submitted by the department showing the deposits and withdrawals and comparative statement made from the passbook of the petitioner.
5. Perusal of the two statements i.e. Annex. P/9 and Annex. R/1, it would reveal that the petitioner has been paid much more than what has been shown by the petitioner in his statement, which is clear from the fact that as per the petitioner the deposits in his credit which should be Rs.2,91,098/- whereas as per the office of Accountant General, the deposit available into the account of the petitioner was Rs.3,03,566/- i.e. there is a difference of about Rs.12,000/- which the petitioner has got more than what is shown as deposit in his account.
6. In view of the same and also taking note of the fact that since subsequently the petitioner has been paid the balance of Rs.35,964/- this Court does not find any grievance further left to be redressed so far as the petitioner's retiral dues is concerned.
7. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge