

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16522 of 2015

=====

Ramayan Prasad Son of Late Hoti Bhagat, Resident of Village- Rukundipur,
P.S.- Daraunda, District- Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Saran Division, Saran at Chapra.
5. The District Magistrate, Siwan.
6. The District Education Officer, Siwan.
7. The District Programme Officer, Siwan.
8. The Block Education Extension Officer, Maharajganj, District- Siwan.
9. The Accountant General, Bihar, Birchand Patel Path, Patna- 800001.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Hitesh Suman, AC to SC-13
For the Accountant General	:	Mr. Ram Kinkar Choubey, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

4 08-02-2024 1. No one appears for the petitioner. Learned counsel
for the respondents are present.

2. The instant application has been filed for the
following relief(s):-

*“That by way of this writ application, the petitioner craves
indulgence of this Hon'ble Court for issuance of a writ in the
nature of Mandamus or an appropriate writ or writs, order or
orders, direction or directions commanding the respondents to
pay the arrear of difference of salary of the petitioner and the
petitioner also prays for the consequential relief/reliefs.”*



3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that a supplementary counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the Block Education Extension Officer, Maharajganj, District-Siwan wherein in paragraph no.12 thereof it has been stated that the difference of salary from 1.1.1971 to 31.9.1973 has been paid vide Bill no. 17/98-99 on 1.12.1998 and the difference of salary from 1.4.1984 to 31.3.1995 has been paid vide Bill no.10/2000-01 on 3.11.2000. It has further been stated in paragraph no.13 thereof that the admissible difference of salary has been paid to the petitioner.

4. As no one appears on behalf of the petitioner, the case is dismissed for non prosecution.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

U			
---	--	--	--

