

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11618 of 2016

=====

Laxmi Narayan Mahto Son of Late Shyamlal Mahto Resident of village -
Parmeshwar, Police Station Lakhnour Madhepur , District - Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India, New Delhi
3. The State of Bihar through the Secretary Home Special Bihar, Patna
4. The District Collector, Madhubani

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Md. Harun Quareshi, Advocate
For the UOI	:	Mr.Ram Anurag Singh, CGC
For State	:	Mr. Nawal Kishore Singh, AC to GP-26

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY

ORAL ORDER

5 20-11-2025 Heard Mr. Md. Harun Quareshi, learned counsel for

the petitioner and the learned counsel for the Union of India

beside the State.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief/s:

*(i) for issuance of a writ in the nature of
mandamus or any other appropriate writ
order or directions commanding the
concerned respondent to pay his samman
pension and arrear of pension since 1999 for
which he is entitled to take his pension from
the Bank;*

*(ii) for issuance of any other relief/ reliefs to
which the petitioner may be entitled to in the*



facts and circumstances of the case.

3. Learned counsel for the Union of India has taken this Court to the letter issued by the State Government [Home] (Special) Department vide letter no. 253 dated 12.07.2010 by which the State Government informed that forged documents have been found in the case of six persons and the name of the petitioner is there at sl. no. 06. This has been attached with the counter affidavit as Annexure-R/2 to the petition after service of copy to the learned counsel for the petitioner on 10.01.2020 but there is no rebuttal to it.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at the time of filing of the petition, the petitioner was 93 years of age and for long, he could not make any contact with him.

5. There is no rebuttal to the said counter affidavit as recorded above, learned counsel has failed to have any communication with the petitioner who was 93 years of age in the year 2016, there is nothing on record to show that the said order was ever challenged, in that background, no further order/step is required in the matter.

6. The writ petition is dismissed.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

