

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1542 of 2022**

=====

Ajay Kumar Singh, S/o Late Dhrub Narayan Singh, Resident of Vilalge and  
P.O.-Chatra, P.S. Dawath, District-Rohtas, PIN-802221.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Finance Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Secretary, Cooperative Department, Govt. of Bihar, 2nd Floor, Vikas Bhawan, New Secretariat, Patna-800015.
4. The Multi State Cooperative land Development Bank Samiti, (Earlier named as Bihar Cooperative Land Development Bank Ltd.) Budh Marg, Patna -800001. through its Chairman.
5. The Chairman, MULTI State Cooperative Land Development Bank Samiti, Budh Marg, Patna -800001.
6. The Managing Director, Multi State Cooperative Land Development Bank Samiti, Budh Marg, Patna -800001.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                      |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Navendu Kumar, Advocate          |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. Accountant General               |
| For the Bank         | : | Mr. Rajesh Kumar Choudhary, Advocate |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

13    27-03-2025                      Heard the parties.

2. The issue in the present writ petition is in limited bound to the extent of according the benefit of contributory provident fund with statutory interest admissible to the petitioner towards his deduction as well as the group insurance amount and the leave encashment.

3. Mr. Navendu Kumar, learned Advocate referring to averments made in the writ petition has contended that the



petitioner was temporarily appointed on the post of Field Officer, at Saraikela, in Bihar State Cooperative Land Development Bank Limited vide memo no. 513 dated 24.08.1981. Later on, the services of the petitioner was duly absorbed on the recommendation made by the Board of Directors of the Bank in its meeting dated 30.11.1986. After serving so many years to the entire satisfaction of the authorities of the Bank, the petitioner was duly appointed on the post of Assistant Manager on contractual basis and in view thereof, the petitioner submitted his joining in the office of the B.S.F.C.. Later on, the services of the petitioner was repatriated to the bank, is the contention of learned Advocate.

4. The aforesaid contention has been refuted by learned Advocate for the bank; referring to memo no. 103 dated 15.06.2009, which is placed on record by filing a counter affidavit. Mr. Rajesh Prasad Choudhary, learned Advocate for the Bank contended that once the order of dismissal has been passed, the petitioner is not entitled to retiral benefits and other dues.

5. On the last occasion, when the matter was taken up, this Court taking note of the fact that since the petitioner had rendered services to the Bank for over a period of 27-28 years,



in any view of the matter as to whether the petitioner is entitled for payment of contributory provident fund, leave encashment and other admissible dues.

6. In response to the order of this Court, today supplementary counter affidavit has been filed in the Court, which is taken on record. It is categorically stated that for the period the petitioner worked in the respondent bank, he will be paid his provident fund amount, subject to the condition that he has not drawn his provident fund amount from the provident fund office; other admissible dues for the period served in the bank, will also be paid in accordance with law.

7. Considering the stand of the Bank, this Court in order to give quietus to the claim of the petitioner thinks it appropriate to dispose off the writ petition with the hope and expectation that the Managing Director of the Bank shall consider the claim of the petitioner in terms of the methodology adopted for according the retiral benefits and other dues to the retired employees and ensure payment of all the due admissible provident fund amount, leave encashment and other benefits.

8. The petitioner shall also be at liberty to bring the fact before the Managing Director of the Bank, if any, of the junior and identically situated persons, have been accorded the



retiral benefits, ignoring the position of the petitioner.

9. The writ petition stands disposed off.

**(Harish Kumar, J)**

supratim/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

