

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.892 of 2015**

**In**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3026 of 2014**

=====

Ram Prakash Paswan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The Bihar State Electricity Board and Ors

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                            |                                     |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s :     | Mr.Kameshwar Prasad Gupta, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s : | Mr.Vinay Kirti Singh, Sr. Advocate  |
|                            | Mr. Vijay Kr. Verma, Advocate       |
|                            | Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Advocate     |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**  
**ORAL ORDER**

- 2      09-12-2021                      With a prayer for award of interest at the rate of 15% on the delayed payment of the statutory dues, petitioner preferred the petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India which was numbered as C.W.J.C. No. 3026 of 2014. The petitioner retired on 3<sup>rd</sup> of April, 2013. Undisputedly, as per the averments made in the petition, all dues were cleared, but however, petitioner claims interest at the rate of 15% on the delayed payment towards the amount due as pension. What is the delay in disbursement of such amount is not referred to in the petition at all. The averments are absolutely vague and unspecific. This is insofar as the merits of the main petition is concerned.



Record reveals that when the said petition was taken up on 16<sup>th</sup> of January, 2015 and 23<sup>rd</sup> of January, 2015, none appeared for the petitioner. This was, perhaps, for the petitioner having lost interest in the matter. Consequently, the petition was dismissed for non-prosecution.

The instant petition stands filed for recall of order whereby the petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution. The only reason assigned is that the learned counsel had requested one of his colleagues to get a pass over and when the matter was called out the said colleague could not attend the Court.

The Court would not venture into the veracity of such facts. But, be that as it may, no purpose would be served in recalling the order, restoring the petition for, as noticed supra, the main petition itself, on merits, merits rejection.

As such, the present petition stands dismissed.

**(Sanjay Karol, CJ)**

K.C.Jha/-

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

