

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4609 of 2024

=====

Sukhdeo Prasad, Son of Late Karu Mahto, Resident of Bari Ashikpur, Near
Airtel Tower, Jamalpur, P.S.- East Colony, District- Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, General
Administration Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Under Secretary, Finance Individual Claim Assessment Cell,
Department of Finance, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Directorate, General Provident Fund, Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Munger.
5. The District Provident Fund Officer, Munger.
6. The District Treasury Officer, Munger.
7. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Munger.
8. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Indu Bhushan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Dr. Md. Raisul Haque, SC-10
For the A.G.	:	Mr. Arun Kumar Arun, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 12-02-2025 Heard the parties.

2. At the outset, learned Advocate for the petitioner
fairly contended that during the pendency of the present writ
petition all the post retiral benefits have been extended to the
petitioner, however, despite the fact that the petitioner
superannuated way back on 31.10.2016 from the post of District
Panchayat Raj Officer, Munger, no interest over the delayed
payment has been made. Reliance has also been placed on the
judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the cases of *State of
Kerala vs. M. Padmanabhan Nair, (1985) 1 SCC 429; D.D.*



Tewari vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd., (2014) 8 SCC 894 and Dr. A. Selvaraj vs. C.B.M. College & Ors., (2022) 4 SCC 627 and also a judgment rendered by this Court in the case of ***Munakiya Devi vs. The State of Bihar and Ors., CWJC No. 20378 of 2018.***

3. At this juncture, learned Advocate for the State as well as Accountant General, Bihar, submit at the Bar that the grievance of the petitioner has been redressed.

4. Considering the aforementioned facts, this Court deems it proper to dispose off the writ petition with a liberty to the petitioner to approach before the respondent no. 4 by filing an appropriate application, with all the facts in relation to delay in payment of the retiral benefits.

5. In case such a representation is filed, preferably within a period of four weeks from today, the concerned respondent shall consider the same and pass a reasoned and speaking order preferably within a further period of 12 weeks thereafter.

6. The writ petition stands disposed off.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

