

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 5420 of 2020**

1. Vijay Babu Dwivedi S/o Late Shri Dharamdash Dwivedi Aged About 58 Years R/o M. I. G. Q. No. 05, Junior Keshar Awas, Near Aryan School, Rajkishore Nagar, Police Station Sarkanda, District Bilaspur, Chattisgarh
--- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Public Works Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Executive Engineer (B/R) Public Works Department, Sub Division No. 2, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chattisgarh
3. Accountant General Chhattisgarh Zero Point Baloda Bazar Road, Post Office- Vidhan Sabha Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Shri S.P. Kale, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Vikas Shrivastava, P.L.
For Respondent No. 3	:	Shri Rajkumar Gupta, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****21.01.2021**

1. The dispute in the present writ petition seems to be some missing entries in the GPF account of the petitioner maintained in the office of the Account General (Respondent No. 3)
2. The facts of the case is that the petitioner is working as an Assistant Grade-III under the respondents No. 1 & 2 since 1988. On account of marriage of his daughter, the petitioner had moved an application for withdrawal of part payment from the GPF amount. However, the same was not accepted on account of there being a mismatch entry so far as the balance of GPF amount as is reflected in the office of the Account General with the balance as is reflected in the office of respondents No. 1 & 2.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case where certain entries which have been made by the respondents No. 1 & 2 in the GPF account has not been properly entered in the account maintained in the office of the Account General (Respondent No. 3).
4. The contention of the petitioner is that in the office of the respondents No. 1 & 2 the employers have properly maintained the GPF account of the petitioner and where there is a credit balance of Rs. 4,74,194/- reflected in the GPF account of the petitioner as on 31.03.2020, however in the GPF account maintained in the office of the Account General there is a lesser amount of only around Rs. 3,54,000/- reflected, thus there is a difference of more than one lakh as compared to the two accounts.
5. Given the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, since the dispute is in-respect-of the GPF account and the entries which have been reflected in the office of the respondents No. 1 & 2, the whole issue can be resolved, if the GPF records maintained in the office of the respondent No. 2 is tallied with that of the records which are available at the office of the respondent No. 3 by counter verifying each of the entries and if required, the petitioner also can be called up for a personal hearing while settling the GPF account of the petitioner.
6. Let the respondents No. 2 & 3 take appropriate steps in verifying the GPF account of the petitioner within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order. The respondents No. 2 & 3 are expected to take an expeditious decision, particularly taking note of the fact that the petitioner has applied for part payment for the purpose of marriage of his daughter.

Sd/-

P. Sam Koshy
Judge