

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6523 of 2020

=====

Mahesh Prasad, Son of Sri Ramjee Rai Yadva, Resident of Mohalla- Yadvo
Lane Mussalhpur Hatt, P.O. Mahendru, P.S. Sultanganj, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Health Department New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Deputy Director Public Health Government of Bihar Office Situated at New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Superintendent, Patna Medical College Hospital, Patna.
4. The Accountant General (A and E), Bihar, Patna Office situated of Birchand Patel Path, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Harendra Kumar, AC to GP-25
For the AG	:	Mr. Vivekanand Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 04-12-2023

There is none to represent the petitioner. However, learned counsel for the State and the Accountant General, Bihar, Patna are present.

2. By referring to the averments made in the counter affidavit filed on behalf of respondent no.3 it is submitted that admissible amount to the tune of Rs.10,98,159/- under the head of GPF, Rs.1,56,948/- under the head of Group Insurance, whereas Rs.4,87,200/- under the head of unutilized earned leave have been paid to the petitioner.

3. He next submitted that so far the claim of medical reimbursement is concerned, the petitioner has already been paid an amount of Rs.4,98,278/-. In token of the



aforesaid payment, the necessary documents have been brought on record by way of Annexures- A and B to the supplementary counter affidavit.

4. Learned counsel for the Accountant General, Bihar, Patna, while reiterating the submissions made on behalf of the learned counsel for the State, submits that the office of the answering respondents has authorized the pension, gratuity, family pension and commutation value of pension in view of sanction by the department and from the records available it appears that the same has already been paid to the petitioner.

5. In view of the submissions advanced on behalf of the learned counsel for the respondents and the materials available on record, the grievance of the petitioner in relation to payment of retiral benefits stand redressed.

6. Thus, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

7. Needless to observe that in case the petitioner finds that still he has any grievance in respect to non-payment of any admissible dues, he is at liberty to file a proper representation before the appropriate authority.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	05.12.2023
Transmission Date	NA

