

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1141 of 2023

=====

Navin Kumar Singh S/o Late Maheshwar Prasad Singh, R/o Village-
Mukundpur Bath, P.S.- Jandaha, Dist- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Road Transport Dept.
Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Administrator, Bihar State Road Transport Corporation, Parabhan
Bhavan, Patna.
3. Regional Manager, Bihar State Road Transport Corporation, Muzaffarpur.
4. Financial Advisor cum Chief Lekha Officer, Bihar State Road Transport
Corporation, Patna.
5. Additional Divisional Manager, Bihar State Road Transport Corporation,
Patna.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Anil Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the Respondents	:	Mr.Prabhat Kumar Verma, Sr. Advocate
		Mr.Jainendra Kr. Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Raghwendra Kumar (SC-22)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 12-05-2023 The petitioner, who has retired on 31.12.2020 from

the post of Samvahak (Conductor) has moved this Court after

three years of his retirement for a direction to the Administrator,

Bihar State Road Transport Corporation, Patna (respondent no.

2) and the Regional Manager (respondent no. 3) to pay his full

salary and other allowances with interest at the rate of 12% for

the period 10.04.2013 to 14.02.2016 which is said to be the

absence period of the petitioner.

It appears that the petitioner had moved earlier to this

Court in CWJC No. 22721/2013 which was disposed of with the



consent of the parties in terms that all the grievance of the petitioner have already been redressed.

It appears on perusal of the records that vide order contained in memo no. 80 dated 12th January, 2013, the petitioner was awarded with certain punishments in a departmental proceeding conducted against him. The disciplinary order specifically states that during the period of suspension the petitioner would not be entitled for anything more than the subsistence allowance, however this period shall not be treated as break in service.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to demonstrate any relevant fact which may have given a fresh cause of action to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the Corporation as well as learned counsel for the State are present.

This Writ Application is dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rajeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

