

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8740 of 2024

=====

Raj Kumar Singh, S/o- Late Vishwananth Singh, R/o- Mohalla- Belabagon,
P.O.- Dabargram, P.S.- Deoghar, District- Deoghar, State- Jharkhand.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Works Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Chief Engineer, Rural Work Department, Manhar, District- Vaishali at Hajipur.
4. The Executive Engineer, Rural Work Department, Manhar, District- Vaishali at Hajipur.
5. The Accountant General (A & E), Bihar, Patna.
6. The Principal Accountant General (A & E), Ranchi, Jharkhand.
7. The Treasury Officer, Deoghar, Jharkhand.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajeev Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr. Prabhajit singh, Advocate Ms. Rushali, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Vivek Prasad, GP-7 Mr. Aman Priyadarshi, AC to GP- 7
For the State of Jharkhand :		Mr. Maruth Nath Roy, Advocates
For the AG, Bihar	:	Mr. Arun Kumar Arun, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 26-03-2025

Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner superannuated from the post of Peon, while working in the Rural Works Department, Work Division, Mahnar, Vaishali, long back on 31.10.2004. Notwithstanding his superannuation in the year 2004, when the petitioner has not been accorded his arrears of pension with Dearness Allowances, Medical Allowances as well as other



allowances along with consequential benefits in view of 5th and 6th Pay Revision, the petitioner has preferred the present writ petition.

3. Mr. Rajeev Kumar Singh, learned Advocate for the petitioner taking this Court through the counter affidavit and the letter of the Accountant General, Bihar dated 25.10.2023 has contended that admittedly the pension of the petitioner was duly revised pursuant to the letter no. 1228 dated 17.08.2023, however, till date the other admissible amount on account of revision of pension has not been accorded to him.

4. Mr. Aman Priyadarshi, learned Advocate for the State referring to the counter affidavit submits that the grievance of the petitioner to the extent of revision of pension has already been redressed. Moreover, if there is still any grievance, the same is required to be considered by the authority concerned.

5. Considering the nature of the grievance and the fact that the petitioner has superannuated long back in the year 2004 itself, this Court deems it apt and proper to dispose of the writ petition with a direction to respondent no.4 to consider the claim of the petitioner, as prayed for in para.1 of the writ petition, in view of the submission of the petitioner that despite the revision of pension, the other admissible amount, including



the consequential benefits as per 5th and 6th pay revision, has not been accorded till date.

6. It is expected that the entire exercise must be completed preferably within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

7. Suffice it to observe that in case the claim of the petitioner finds favour, necessary consequential monetary benefits shall be accorded to him within the period aforenoted.

8. With the aforesaid observation, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	27.03.2025
Transmission Date	NA

