

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16024 of 2023

=====

Rajendra Pal, S/o Late Shrishiv Lagan Bhagat, resident of Mohalla- Lodipur,
P.O. -G.P.O., P.S. Gandhi Maidan, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director (Higher Education), Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Patna.
4. The District Education Officer, Patna.
5. The District Programme Officer (Estb.), Patna.
6. The District Provident Fund Officer, Patna.
7. The District Programme Officer (Estb.), Supaul.
8. The District Provident Fund Officer, Saharsa.
9. The District Programme Officer (Estb.), Khagaria.
10. The District Provident Fund Officer, Khagaria.
11. The District Programme Officer (Estb.), Begusarai.
12. The District Provident Fund Officer, Begusarai.
13. The In-charge Headmaster, Govt.Plus 2 High School, Virpur, Sapaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dhirdyuti Kumar Verma, Advocate Mr. Parmeshwar Vishwakarma, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Prabhakar Jha, GP- 27

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 30-06-2026

Heard learned Advocate for the respective parties.

2. The petitioner despite being superannuated from the post of Peon on 31.05.2022 from the office of District Education Officer, Patna has not been allowed the retiral benefits, including the General Provident Fund and Group Insurance, as also the arrears of due salary from February, 1999



to May, 1999 has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition. The challenge has also been made to the action of the respondents whereby the Last Payment Certificate, as contained in Memo No. 1347 dated 21.10.2013, issued by the Block Education Officer, Begusarai whereby the LPC has been issued by reducing the basic salary from 9,040/- to 8,000/- per month.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner and the State fairly submitted that during the pendency of the writ petition, all the outstanding benefits have been paid to the petitioner. So far the claim for salary of the petitioner from February, 1999 to May, 1999 is concerned, it would be considered by the competent authority after proper verification of the available record, as the petitioner has approached this Court belatedly for the salary for the month of February, 1999 to May, 1999.

4. Learned Advocate for the State further contended that the LPC has been issued based upon the record.

5. Considering the fact that there is no proper response with respect to the claim of the petitioner regarding reducing the basic pay from Rs.9,040 to Rs. 8,000/-, besides his salary for four months, this Court deems it apt and proper to direct the concerned District Programme Officer



(Establishment) to consider the claim of the petitioner and pass a reasoned and speaking order preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order. In case, the case of the petitioner finds favour, necessary order shall be issued in this regard within the stipulated period.

6. With the aforesaid, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	01.07.2026
Transmission Date	NA

