

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18366 of 2019

=====

Ramayan Tiwary, Son of Late Ganpat Tiwary, Resident of Priyadarshi Nagar,
DPS More, Bailey Road, P.S.- Rupaspur, Town and District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Union of India
2. The Chief Executive Cum Managing Director, Punjab National bank, Head office, Plot No. 4, Sector- 10, Dwarka, New Delhi- 110075.
3. The Executive Director, Punjab National Bank, Head office, Plot No.4, Sector- 10, Dwarka, New Delhi- 110075.
4. The General Manager, Human Resources Department Punjab national bank, Head Office, Plot No. 4, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi- 110075.
5. The General Manager, PF and Pension Fund Department Punjab National bank, Head office, Plot No. 4, Sector-10, Dwarka, new Delhi- 110075.
6. The Circle Head, Punjab National Bank, Circle office Anand Bhawan, Rai Kashi Nath More, Swaraj Puri Road, Gaya- 823001.
7. The Circle Head, Punjab National bank Circle office Chanakya Tower, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna - 800001.
8. The Chairman, Dakshhin Bihar Gramin Bank, Head office, Bishnu Commercial Complex, Ashachak, N.H.-30, Patna- 800016.
9. The Regional Officer Dakshin Gramin Bank, 37/A, A.P. Colony, Gaya, Pin- 823001.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Suresh Pd. Singh No. 1, Advocate
For the Bank	:	Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

9 28-10-2024 None appears on behalf of the petitioner.

2. Earlier also when the matter was take up on 21.10.2024, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

3. Learned Advocate for the Punjab National Bank and learned Advocate for the respondent no. 8 and 9 are also present.

4. Drawing the attention of this Court to the



averments made in the counter affidavit it is contended that the claim of the petitioner for revision and re-fixation of pension is not permissible in view of the letter no. 4/8/6/98-IR dated 27.11.1998 issued by the Deputy Secretary to the Government of India to the Deputy Personnel Adviser, Indian Bank's Association, Mumbai and also letter no. PD/CIR/76/G(ii)/1521 dated 11.01.1999 issued by the Deputy Personnel Adviser, Indian Bank's Association to the designated officers of the Public Sector Banks.

5. By the afore-noted letters it has been made clear that the substantive pay that an officer would have drawn in the parent bank, but for his deputation, be taken as the pay for calculating average emoluments for the purpose of pensionary benefits and not the pay actually drawn by the officer in the higher scale in the loanee organization.

6. Considering the averments made in the writ petition which has not been responded by the petitioner till date, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition, and accordingly stands dismissed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

