

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2937 of 2020

=====

Smt. Amalti Devi w/o Late Mahendra Singh, Resident of Village and P.O.-
Belkhara, P.s.- Karpi, District- Arwal

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Punjab National Bank through its Chief Executive Director, Punjab National Bank, New Delhi
2. The Chief Executive Director, Punjab National Bank, New Delhi
3. The Assistant General Manager, Provident Fund and Pension Department, Punjab National Bank, New Delhi
4. The Circle Head, HRD, Punjab National Bank, Gaya Pramandal, Gaya
5. The Senior Manager, HRD, Punjab National Bank, Gaya Mandal Office, 400 Anugrah Colony, Gaya
6. The Branch Manager, Beikhara Branch of Punjab National Bank, District-Arwal

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr .Ram Chandra Prasad Bharti, Adv.
For the Punjab National Bank:		Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar,
		Mr. Ram Ganesh,
		Ms. Shilpi Singh,
		Mr. Vibhuti Kumar, Advocates.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

6 22-02-2023 Heard the parties.

2. Husband of the petitioner was working as part time sweeper in Punjab National Bank. According to the petitioner, her husband started working as part time sweeper/daily wager w.e.f. 14.09.1985. The husband of the petitioner died on 30.03.2011.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that the death-cum-retiral benefit of the husband of the petitioner is not being



paid by the Respondent-Bank.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the Respondent-Bank submits that the husband of the petitioner was being engaged as a part time sweeper/worker on the basis of requirement of work. He was not rendering his service regularly in the Bank and however, the Bank regularized his services on 01.05.2010 and within eleven months, the husband of the petitioner died. Accordingly, death-cum-post retiral benefits payable to the petitioner is to the extent of 43,860/- towards gratuity. Other benefits viz, family pension etc., are not payable to the petitioner.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the factual background of this case and the fact that the husband of the petitioner did not complete the qualifying service for pension/family pension, accordingly, I do not find any merit in this writ application. The petition stands dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

U			
---	--	--	--

