

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20074 of 2013

=====

Avinash Chaudhary Son Of Late Lakhan Lal Chaudhary Resident Of Village-
Charown, P.O. Nawegarhi, District- Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Director General Of Police, Bihar, Patna
3. The Deputy Director General Of Police, Purnia Region, Purnia
4. The Inspector General Of Police, Purnia Region, Purnia
5. The Superintendent Of Police, Kishanganj

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Amit Prakash, Advocate
For the State : S.C.1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

9 30-06-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. An interlocutory application bearing I.A. No. 1 of 2026 has been filed for recall of order dated 12.05.2026, whereby on the basis of the statement given by the learned counsel for the State-Respondents to the effect that pursuant to order dated 20.04.2026 steps have been taken for payment of due salary/subsistence allowance to the petitioner, however the payments have not been made till date. Accordingly, it was directed that the matter be listed on 23.06.2026 and in the meantime, a cost of Rs.5000/- has to be deposited in the Patna High Court Legal Services Committee. It appears from the averments made in the interlocutory application that the payments were credited in the



bank account of the petitioner on 11.05.2026, however the same was not brought to the notice of this Court.

3. Considering the submissions made in I.A. No. 1 of 2026, the interlocutory application is allowed.

C.W.J.C. No.20074 of 2013

4. The learned counsel for the State-Respondents submits that all the admitted dues have already been paid to the petitioner in his bank account on 11.05.2026 and now nothing remains to be paid to the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner admits that an amount to the tune of Rs.1,95,279/- has been credited in the bank of the petitioner on 11.05.2026.

6. Keeping in view the statements made in the interlocutory application, the prayer made in the writ petition has been granted by the respondents-authorities and now the writ petition has become infructuous.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

(Ritesh Kumar, J.)

Sanjay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

