

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11847 of 2024

Mostt. Sudama Devi Wife of Late Girja Nandan Singh, Resident of village
Paterha Jairam, P.S. Vaishali, District Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Minor Irrigation Department,
Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Deputy Secretary, Minor Irrigation Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Executive Engineer, Minor Irrigation Division, Chhapra.
4. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Provident Fund Officer, Chhapra.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kamlesh Prasad Yadav, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sheo Shankar Prasad, SC-8

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 30-04-2025 Heard the parties.

2. At the outset, learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that so far death-cum-retiral benefits and other dues are concerned, the same has already been accorded, but it is rather unfortunate that the family pension of the petitioner has been wrongly fixed on a minimum pay scale and for which the petitioner has approached before all the authorities concerned, but to no avail.

3. Learned Advocate for the State drawing the



attention of this Court to the averments made in the counter affidavit has submitted that earlier the husband of the petitioner has approached this Court in C.W.J.C No. 6966 of 1999 seeking direction to the respondents to make payment of the retiral dues, however, he died on 08.10.1999 during pendency of the said writ petition; subsequent thereto the legal heirs were substituted and the writ petition came to be disposed off vide order dated 07.04.2000 with a direction to the respondent no. 3 to verify the payment of provident fund amount to the original writ petitioner and in case of non-payment, take necessary steps for release of the same. Pursuant to the order of this Court, the provident fund amount of the deceased employee had been paid by the Executive Engineer, Minor Irrigation Division, Chapra.

4. It is further contended that the provident fund amount to the tune of Rs. 50,950/- had been paid to the original writ petitioner during his life time. So far the claim of the petitioner with regard to the wrong fixation of the family pension is concerned, the same has not specifically been raised in the writ petition.

5. Considering the submissions advanced by learned Advocate for the petitioner, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition and accordingly the same stands closed.



However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to raise his grievance before the authorities concerned, if so desired.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

