

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.692 of 2019

=====

Arun Kumar Tripathy, Son of late Ram Naresh Tripathy, Resident of 201, C-Block, Lekhrej Parisar, Road No. 3, Patel Nagar, Patna- 23, District- Patna, presently residing at New Chitragupta Nagar, Parbati Path behind Ram Kumar Apartment, Kankarbagh, Patna- 20

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of SC/ST Welfare, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Department of SC/ST Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Welfare Officer, Motihari, East Champaran.
4. The District Provident Fund Officer, Motihari, East Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dudh Nath Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. S.K. Mandal, SC 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 23-06-2020

The matter has been heard *via* video conferencing due to lockdown imposed on account of the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Heard Mr. Dudh Nath Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. S K Mandal, learned SC 3 for the State.

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

- i) *For issuance of direction/directions, order/orders or writ/writs particularly in the nature of Mandamus for commanding and directing the Respondent Authorities to make payment of G.P.F. statutory interest of the petitioner.*
- ii) *For any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is legally entitled under the fact and circumstances of this case.*

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that he has not been paid his full retiral dues.



5. Learned counsel for the State submitted that the petitioner is a dismissed employee and against such order he has moved before the High Court and the matter is still pending. However, it was submitted that with regard to remaining dues of GPF and GIC, the same have been paid. It was submitted that in view of the petitioner being dismissed from service, which order has still not been interfered with, the petitioner is not entitled to any further payment. Learned counsel submitted that copy of the counter affidavit was served on learned counsel for the petitioner in October, 2019, itself and there is no reply to the same.

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submission of learned counsel for the parties, the Court finds that for the present, whatever the petitioner was entitled to by way of terminal benefits, has been paid.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed off.

8. However, depending on the result of the challenge by the petitioner to his order of termination, if anything further is payable, the same shall be paid to the petitioner in accordance with law.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J)

J. Alam/-

AFR/NAFR	
U	
T	

