

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8937 of 2016

Amarnath Sharma son of late Ram Krit Sharma, resident of Village-
Pachrukhi, P.O. Pachrukhi, District- Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the D.M., Siwan.
2. The Industrial Corporation Pvt. Ltd. at Bihar Sugar Works, Pachrukhi, District- Siwan.
3. The Managing Director, Bihar Sugar Works, Pachrukhi, District- Siwan.
4. The General Manager, Bihar Sugar Works, Pachrukhi, P.O. and P.S. Pachrukhi, District- Siwan.
5. The Chief Engineer, Bihar Sugar Works, Pachrukhi, District- Siwan.
6. The Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar, Patna, Ashok Rajpath, Patna-4.
7. The Accounts Officer, deputed in the Office of Regional Provident fund Commissioner, Bihar, Patna.
8. The Zonal Manager, Central Bank of India, Jaiprakash Chowk, Siwan, P.O. Siwan, District- Siwan.
9. The Branch Manager, Central Bank of India, Siwan , At its branch at Jaiprakash Chowk Siwan, District-Siwan.
10. The Debt Recovery Tribunal/ Patna, through its recovery Officer at its office at boring Canal Road, Patna, P.O- GPO, District-Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Syed Md. Najmul Bari, Advocate
for the State	:	Mr. Ram Vinay Pd. Singh (Sanjay), Advocate
For Respondent Bank	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Sinha, Sr. Advocate
		Miss. Dilkash Khan, Advocate
		Miss. Minu Kumari, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 05-12-2023 Heard the parties.

2. The present writ application has been filed after 35 years of death of the father of the petitioner for directing the respondents, particularly the respondent nos.3,4 & 5 who is private company to make payment of the salary of the father of



the petitioner, which is due from 01.03.1974 to 01.03.1976.

3. Learned counsel for the Bank submits that father of the petitioner was died long back in the year 1981 and the present writ application has been filed in the year 2016 against the private company to make payment of dues salary of the father of the petitioner.

4. The writ petition is not maintainable accordingly the writ petition dismissed as non-maintainable.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Prakash Narayan

U			
---	--	--	--

