

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18250 of 2017

Mostt. Ram Sakhi Devi Wife of Late Gore Lal Das, Resident of Village-
Maher, Police Station- Sikandara, Post Office- Kalyar, District- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Panchayat Raj, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Provident Fund, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Jamui.
4. The District Provident Officer, Munger.
5. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Jamui, District- Jamui.
6. The Block Development Officer, Jamui, District- Jamui.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arun Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Pushkar Narayan Shahi -AAG6

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 29-05-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and counsel
for the State through video conferencing.

In this case, the petitioner has confined his prayer with regard to non-payment of General Provident Fund (G.P.F.) along with interest submitting that though other retiral dues has been paid but, the G.P.F. has not been paid to her.

From the record, it appears that her husband, namely, Late Gore Lal Das has retired from service on 1.2.1992 from the post of Panchayat Supervisor under the Block Jamui at District Jjamui and died on 23.2.2012. All the retiral dues except G.P.F. amount was settled and this lady is moving here and there for



payment of the same.

A counter affidavit has been filed by the respondent no.2 in which a specific assertion has been made that the final G.P.F. has been paid to the petitioner amounting Rs. 5,15,859/- inclusive of all statutory interest therein but, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the entire period has not been taken into consideration for calculating the interest and certain period has been left out but, from the records, it appears that the entire period of service has been taken into consideration for calculating the interest amount and the petitioner has been paid the entire amount inclusive interest.

In that view of the matter, this Court does not find any merit in the contention of the petitioner that the entire period for the purpose of interest has not been taken into consideration. As the payment has been made to the petitioner, this writ application has been rendered infructuous.

Accordingly, this writ application is dismissed as having become infructuous.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

rishi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

