

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11 of 2024

=====

Maheshi Ram alias Maheshi Paswan son of Late Kuldip Paswan, Resident of village Shankarpur, PS Haspura, District Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Primary Education Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Regional Deputy Director, Education Department, Aurangabad.
5. The District Programme Officer, (Establishment), Aurangabad.
6. The Director General, Provident Fund, Government of Bihar, Patna.
7. The District Provident Fund Officer, Aurangabad.
8. The Head Master, Government Primary School, Khutaha, Obra, Aurangabad.
9. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.
10. The Treasury Officer, Aurangabad, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Birendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Chaitanya Swaroop, AAG-5
		Mr. Vishambhar Prasad, AC to AAG-5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 15-07-2024 Heard the parties.

2. At the outset, learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that now the grievance of the petitioner is only confined to the arrears of difference of pension on account of 6th and 7th Pay Revision. Learned Advocate for the petitioner also submitted that though the petitioner superannuated as an Assistant Teacher on 31.03.2000 from Government Middle School, Khutaha, Obra, Aurangabad. But he has not been given



the benefit of Assured Career Progression Scheme, 2003. It is also the contention of the petitioner that despite reaching the age of 80 years, the petitioner has also not been allowed the additional enhanced 20 per cent pension over the basic monthly pension.

3. Learned Advocate for the State contended that the petitioner had superannuated in the year 2000 and the writ petition has been filed after a delay of 23 years, that too without approaching before the concerned authority and on this score alone, the writ petition is fit to be rejected.

4. Counter affidavits have been filed on behalf of the respondent no. 5 as well as respondent nos. 6 and 7. It is categorically averred that the answering respondent vide letter no. 119 dated 06.01.2024 had requested the petitioner to provide the necessary documents for addressing the grievances, whereupon the petitioner has submitted the required documents. The claim of the petitioner is under consideration and it is submitted on behalf of the respondent that the grievance of the petitioner will be addressed at the earliest.

5. Considering the averments made in the counter affidavits that the grievance of the petitioner has been taken note of by the respondent authorities and is under consideration, the



writ petition stands disposed of with a direction to the concerned respondents to bring the claim of the petitioner to its logical conclusion, preferably within a period of four weeks; consequent thereto any amount, if found due, shall be paid to him.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

U			
---	--	--	--

