

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4352 of 2020

=====

Anandi Kumar Son of Jago Prasad R/o- Chaturbhujpur, P.S.- Pandarak,
District- Patna. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through Principal Secretary, Human Resources Dept.
Govt. of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Vice Chancellor Tilkamanjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
3. The Registrar-cum- Finance Officer Tilkamanjhi Bhagalpur University,
Bhagalpur.
4. Vice Chancellor Munger University, Munger.
5. Registrar Munger University, Munger.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Gouranga Chatterjee, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Kameshwar Kumar (GP-17)
For TMB University	:	Mr. A. Mustafa, Advocate
For Munger University	:	Smt. Nivedita Nirvikar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL ORDER

2 03-03-2020 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner is aggrieved by inaction on the part of the respondents in the matter of payment of arrears of salary.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has been discriminated in the matter of payment of arrears of salary. Referring to Annexure-9 learned counsel submits that similarly circumstanced teachers, namely, Abhimanyu Kumar, Assistant Professor, English and Dr. Nawal Prasad have been granted the benefit of arrears but in the case of the petitioner the University took a different stand.

The University is extended arm of the State, as such in all activities, it is expected to act in accordance with the mandate of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India as



held out by the **Apex Court in Ramana Dayaram Shetty Vs. The International Airport Authority Of India And Ors.:AIR 1979 (SC) 1628**. The State cannot discriminate a citizen even in the matter of distribution of largess and bounty.

In view of the decision of the Apex Court in the case of Ramana Dayaram Shetty (Supra), the present writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the University to revisit the entire claim of the petitioner and if it is found that similarly circumstanced others have been paid arrears, similar treatment should be extended to the petitioner. Necessary corrective measures must be taken by the respondents at the earliest preferably within a maximum period of 60 days from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order. It goes without saying that monetary benefits arising out of decision must reach the petitioner within the time frame as indicated hereinabove.

With the aforesaid, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

spandey/-

U			
---	--	--	--

