

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3991 of 2021

1. Rom Lal Gendle S/o Shri Balbhaddar Gendle Aged About 65 Years R/o Sonkar Sales, Behind Lic Office, Mungeli , District Mungeli Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Principal Secretary Agriculture Department , Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. The Accountant General Zero Point , Balouda Bazar Road, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Deputy Director Agriculture Sukma, District Sukma Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Abhishek Pandey, Advocate
For State/Res. No. 1 & 3.	: Shri Ayaz Naved, G.A.
For Respondent No. 2	: Shri Nikhil Parakh, Advocate under instruction of Shri Ramakant Mishra, ASG.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

05/08/2021

1. The sole grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petitioner is on the amount of Rs. 1,11,206/- released under the Head of the GPF whereas on the date of retirement, the petitioner had a credit balance of more than 9,82,000/- in his account.
2. According to the counsel for the petitioner, as per record of the GPF available with the petitioner the last balance available was more than 8,47,000/- and which according to the petitioner upto the period of retirement has gone uptill 9,82,788/-. However when the GPF amount was settled, he has been paid only an amount of Rs. 1,11,206/-

3. The State Counsel on the other hand referring to the records submits that it appears that because of certain missing entries, the amount released to the petitioner could be on the lower side or may be that there are certain entries of PF withdrawal that the petitioner may have made which may not have been properly entered in the pass book maintained with the petitioner which must have given rise to this conclusion.
4. All said and done, since the dispute is confined only to the GPF amount payable to the petitioner. The petitioner admits that, he has received all the other dues and this dispute of GPF amount payable can be resolved only after due verification of the entries of provident fund account maintained under the respondents No. 1 & 3 and counter verified from the records maintained under the respondent No.2.
5. Needless to say, if required, the petitioner also be given a personal hearing to satisfy on the fact that there has been no withdrawal as such which are not reflected in the entries and as regards his claim for an amount of more than 9,82,700/- as he claims. If required, the petitioner can also be asked to produce the relevant records that he has in his possession to prove his contention.
6. Given the said facts and situations, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondents No. 1 & 3 to ensure that the entire provident fund records of the petitioner maintained under the respondents No. 1 & 3 is made available for being duly verified by the respondent No. 2. The respondent No. 2 and Respondents No. 1

& 3 inturn in the course of verification may call upon the petitioner also for his satisfaction and thereafter, reach to a specific conclusion as to whether the amount paid to the petitioner of Rs. 1,11,206/- to be proper and justified.

7. If the petitioner is entitled for any further amount, the same shall also be forthwith released to the petitioner along with the interest that otherwise would have accrued on the provident fund account, within a further period of 60 days from the date of scrutiny of the entire records. Let this scrutiny be done at the first instance within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
8. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

J-