

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7694 of 2016

=====

Satyendra Narayan Singh Son of Late Mundrika Singh, Resident of Village -
Bagtarpa, P.O. - Jagatpur, P.S. - Barun and District - Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The South Bihar Power Distribution Company ltd. through its Managing Director, Vidut Bhawan, Bailey
3. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad. null null
4. The General Manager Section Human Resource The South Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Vidyut
5. The Senior Manager Finance and Account South Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan,
6. The Executive Engineer, Electric Supply Sub Division, Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the Respondent/s	:	Mrs. Archana Meenakshee, GP-06
For R Nos. 2 & 4-6	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Gautam, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA
ORAL ORDER

4 20-11-2024 None appears on behalf of the petitioner.

2. Heard learned counsel for the respondents.

3. The petitioner, who was a Switch Board Operator Grade-II under the Electric Supply Division, Aurangabad, has filed this writ petition for payment of over time salary due from 16.10.2008 excluding the financial year 2012-13 to the petitioner.

4. Respondent nos. 2 and 4 to 6 have filed a counter affidavit as well as a supplementary counter affidavit. In paragraph no. 5 of the supplementary counter affidavit filed, it



has been stated that over time salary due from 08.01.2009 to 24.11.2012 and 04.02.2014 to 25.12.2014 has been calculated as per the provision of the company and the petitioner has been paid Rs. 84,527/- vide Cheque no. 341504 dated 08.10.2016.

5. Though, the supplementary counter affidavit by respondent nos. 2 and 4 to 6 was filed on 11.07.2018, but no rejoinder thereto has been filed by the petitioner disputing the correctness of the overtime salary paid to the petitioner, as stated by the respondents in paragraph no. 5 of the supplementary counter affidavit.

6. Under the circumstances, I find that the overtime salary to which the petitioner was entitled to, has been paid by the respondents to the petitioner.

7. In that view of the matter, the writ petition is disposed of with no consequential order.

(Nani Tagia, J)

Amrendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

