

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.979 of 2022

-
1. Gauri Shankar Prasad Son of Bindeshwar Prasad, resident of Village - Pakari, Police Station- Riga, District - Sitamarhi.
 2. Shrawan Kumar Son of Late Surendra Prasad Sinha, resident of Village - Dumri Kalan, Police Station- Mejorganj, District - Sitamarhi.
 3. Lal Babu Baitha Son of Sri Tapeswar Baitha, resident of Village - Muradpur, Police Station- Dumra, District - Sitamarhi.
 4. Ravi Bhushan Son of Sri Mod Narayan Rai, resident of Village - Sirkhidia, Police Station- Runisaidpur, District - Sitamarhi.
 5. Mukesh Kumar Son of Sri Jaleswar Mahto, resident of Village - Madhopur Raushanvisa, Police Station- Dumra, District - Sitamarhi.
 6. Anil Kumar, Son of Late Kameshwar Singh, resident of Village - Balua, Police Station - Dumra, District - Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Co-operative, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Board of Director's through its Chairman Sitamarhi Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Sitamarhi.
4. The Managing Director, Sitamarhi Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Kundan Kumar Sinha, Advocate Mr. Aditya Narain Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Amit Prakash (GA-13)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

4 10-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State of Bihar. No one appears on behalf of the respondent nos. 3 and 4.

2. The petitioners have filed the instant application for the following relief (s) :-



“1. That this is an application for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or direction commanding the respondent Managing Director to grant the benefits of pay scale in terms of recommendation of 10th Bipartite Settlements, since each and every employees of the respondent bank have been granted the benefit of pay scale in terms of 10th Bipartite settlements except these six petitioners (employees of the Bank).

The reasons for denial is indicated in the order dated 27.3.2019 i.e. since a case i.e. C.W.J.C.No.5457 of 2019 is pending before the Hon'ble Court. The said case is related to the manners of appointment of these petitioners by the Board of Directors of the Respondent Bank. The C.W.J.C.No.5457 of 2019 is nothing to do with the issue of pay scale of these petitioners".

A photo/true copy of the proceeding of Board meeting dated 30.10.2018 which was communicated vide letter dated 27.3.2019 is annexed herewith and marked as Annexure-1 to this writ application.”

3. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the material on record, it transpires that a counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the respondent no.4 wherein the statement made is to the effect that the petitioners herein have already been granted the benefits of the 10th



Bipartite Settlement by the Board of Directors of the Bank from November, 2018 when they were regularized and as such no further grievance of the petitioners subsists.

4. The relevant part of the counter affidavit of respondent no.4 is reproduced herein below for ready reference :-

“9. That, with respect to the facts of the case, the Board of Directors of the Bank has taken a lenient view and granted the benefits of the 10th Bipartite Settlement to the petitioners. Consequently, the petitioners have already been extended the said benefits vide resolution of the Board dated 13.01.2022.

10. That the petitioners had initially joined the Bank as outsourced employees and were subsequently regularized with effect from 29.11.2018. Accordingly, the benefit of the 10th Bipartite Settlement has been granted to them from November 2018. Therefore, the petitioners have no subsisting grievance.

11. That in view of the above, the grievances raised in the present writ petition stand redressed.

12. That it is reiterated that the petitioners are already receiving the benefits of the 10th Bipartite Settlement, just like other employees. In light of this, there remains no outstanding grievance, and the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.”



5. In view of the above, in the opinion of the Court,
nothing remains to be decided in the instant writ application.
6. The writ application is disposed of.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

U			
---	--	--	--

