

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.24153 of 2019**

=====

Ramvilash Singh, Son of Late Lochi Singh, Resident of Village- Mandaul,  
P.O.- Mira Bigaha, P.S.- Chakand, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Addl. Secretary, Panchayat Raj Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Addl. Secretary, Panchayat Raj Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Gaya.
4. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Gaya, District- Gaya.
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Gaya, District- Gaya.
6. The Block Development Officer, Barachatti, District- Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                                        |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra, Adv.<br>Mr. Deepak Kumar, Adv. |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. Manish Kumar, AC to AAG-6                          |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

7      13-01-2020                      Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. In compliance of this Court's order dated 06.12.2019, a counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the Principal Secretary, Panchayat Raj Department, Government of Bihar, wherein it has been stated that the District Magistrate, Gaya and the Block Development Officer, Barachatti are the immediate controlling officers of the petitioner, who are competent to look into the grievances of the petitioner and take necessary action.

3. It has further been stated that the petitioner's case



for grant of ACP has now been taken up and he has been granted the benefits of first and second ACP. Since the petitioner has been found not entitled to the benefit of third MACP, the same has been declined, since the petitioner superannuated on 01.01.2003, before coming into force of MACP Rules, 2010 with effect from 01.01.2009.

4. Considering the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents, it transpires that the grievance of the petitioner has been substantially redressed. It will, however, be open to the petitioner to question the correctness of determination of arrears by making appropriate representation before the competent authority.

5. This application stands disposed of accordingly.

**(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)**

Rajesh/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

