

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4656 of 2026

-
1. Santosh Kumar Son of Purushotum Prasad, Resident of Mohalla- Kumahar Toli, Sohni Patti, Police Station- Buxar, District- Buxar
 2. Krishna Mohan Singh Son of Baleshwar Singh, Resident of Village- Basantpur, Police Station- Aara Sadar, District- Bhojpur
 3. Mahendra Kumar Singh Son of Sadhu Singh, Resident of Village- Chaumukha, Pirauta Police Station- Krishnagarh, District- Bhojpur
 4. Saroj Narayan Mishra Son of Brij Bihar Mishra, Resident of Mohalla- Civi Line, Police Station- Buxar, District- Buxar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Finance, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Treasury Officer, Sasaram, District- Rohtas
4. The Drawing and Disbursing Officer, Civil Court, Sasaram, District- Rohtas
5. The Managing Director, Protean e-Gov Technologies Limited (formerly NSDL e-Governance Infrastructure Limited), 1st Floor, Times Tower, Kamala Mills Compound, Senapati Bapat Marg, Lower Parel, Mumbai - 400013

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Narendra Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Anant Pd. Singh (SC-15)
		Mrs. Deepika Sharma (AC to SC-15)
For the Resp. no.4	:	Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 30-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the Respondent no.4.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the following relief/s:-

“1. For issuance of a writ in the nature of



mandamus or any other appropriate writ/writs, order(s), direction(s) commanding and directing the Respondents to credit the amount of C.P.F. and other statutory deduction deducted from Salary of the Petitioners along with contribution of the employer during the period of December, 2007 to March, 2010 into Permanent Retirement Account Number [PRAN] under new pension scheme [NPS] along with due accrued interest equivalent to Net Assets Value [NAV] of the units of the non-credited amount as per current market value.

II. Any other orders, direction/directions to which the petitioners are deemed entitle.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that for fulfillment of their grievances, the Treasury Officer, Sasaram, Rohtas (Respondent no.3) is the competent person. Counsel submits that the letters and reminders were sent from the Drawing and Disbursing Officer, Civil Court, Sasaram, Rohtas (Respondent no.4) to the Treasury Officer, Sasaram, Rohtas (Respondent no.3) several times, but no decision has been taken by the Respondent no.3 till date. The last option left to the petitioners is filing the present writ petition and demand writ in the nature of mandamus.



4. Learned counsel appearing for Respondent no.4 submits that it is true that the Drawing and Disbursing Officer, Civil Court, Sasaram, Rohtas has written letter to Respondent no.3. But, from the record, it transpires that the representation has been filed by only one petitioner namely, Santosh Kumar (petitioner no.1).

5. In the light of the submissions made, this Court without entering into the merit or demerit of this case hereby directs all the petitioners to file a fresh representation along with a copy of this order before the Treasury Officer, Sasaram, Rohtas (Respondent no.3), within 30 days from today. Upon receipt of the same, the Respondent no.3 is directed to pass a reasoned and speaking order on the petitioners' representation, within 60 days thereafter. It is made clear that prior to passing a reasoned and speaking order, the Respondent no.3 shall consult with the Respondent no.4 within the said period.

6. Accordingly, with the aforesaid direction, this writ petition stands disposed off.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

