

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13494 of 2013

=====

Kusheshwar Mishra S/O Late Bhulan Mishra Resident Of Village- Prabhat
Nagar, Ward No. 25, P.S- Katihar, District- Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Bihar State Power Holding Company Limited., Bihar State Electricity Board, Vidhyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna Through Its, Secretary.
2. The Chairman, The Bihar State Power Holding Company Ltd., Bihar State Electricity Board, Vidhyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Joint Secretary, The Bihar State Power Holding Company Ltd., Bihar State Electricity Board, Vidhyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. The Superintending Engineer, Electrical Supply Circle Munger, District- Munger.
5. The Deputy General Manager H.R/ Administration, Bihar State Power Holding Company, Ltd., Bihar State Electricity Board, Vidhyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Subodh Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Vinay Kirti Singh, Sr. Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

5 30-09-2024 Petitioner has *inter alia* prayed for following reliefs
in the paragraphs No.1 of the writ petition:-

*“That this writ application is being filed for
issuance of an appropriate writ/writs, order or orders
in the nature of certiorari for quashing of the memo of
charge dated 14.05.2013 issued under the signature of
respondent No.4 by which the respondent No.4 has
issued the aforesaid letter framing two groundless
charges having no foundational fact only with a view to
harass and humiliate the petitioner as the petitioner
has already been retired from the post of Accounts
Officer from the office of respondent No.4 the
Superintending Engineer, Supply Circle, Munger with*



effect from 30.01.12 and in spite of that he is neither getting the pension and the gratuity amount reasons best known to them and further for any other appropriate relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled in the facts and circumstances of this case.

2. Considering the statement made in paragraph nos.7 and 8 of the counter affidavit filed on behalf of respondents and its officials, it appears that for the reason that the petitioner has handed over his complete charge to his successor employee actually on 30.06.2012 and not on 29.07.2011, the departmental proceeding has been initiated against him and 90% pension is being paid to the petitioner. However, no information in respect of final result of the departmental proceeding has been brought on record.

3. Considering the aforesaid fact, the respondent concerned is directed to communicate the petitioner in respect of the result of the departmental proceeding, so that the petitioner may avail appropriate legal remedy, in case he is aggrieved by any order passed during the pendency of the writ petition by the authority concerned.

4. It is made clear that petitioner has not been able to inform in this respect before this Court about any development which has taken place.



5. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

6. Interlocutory Application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Sanjay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

