CGHC010371822026 2026:CGHC:43413

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 7335 of 2026

AMARDEEP CHOUBEY Digitally signed by AMARDEEP CHOUBEY Date: 2026.10.12 10:46:27 +0530

1 - Rajkumar Chaturvedi S/o Narayan Prasad Aged About 74 Years Retired From The Post Of Head Master Goverment Middle School, Sardha, R/o -Aawas Para, Ranigaon, Block -Lormi, Dist. -Mungeli (C.G.)

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Ita Secretary Department Of School Education Department, Naya Raipur, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Raipur (C.G.)

2 - General Administration Department Of Chhattisgarh, Pension Redressal Committee Through Secretary, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, C.G.

3 - Accountant General Of Chhattisgarh, Raipur, Zero-Point, Near Avinash Garden City, Raipur Baloda Bazar Marg Opp. Vidhan Sabha Road, Barauda, Chhattisgarh.

4 - District Education Officer, Mungali, Dist.-Mungeli (C.G.)

5 - Joint Director Treasury, Accounts And Pension, Division- Bilaspur, (C.G.)

6 - Block Education Officer, Block -Lormi, Dist.-Mungeli (C.G.)

... Respondents

(Cause title is taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Pallav Mishra, Advocate
For State	: Mr. Shreyansh Mehta, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No.3	: Mr. R.K. Gupta, Advocate

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE BIBHU DATTA GURU)

Order on Board

07/10/2026

1. By the present petitioner, the petitioner has prayed for following reliefs:-

> “10.1 This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow the petition filed by the petitioner by quashing the Impugned order Annexure P-1,
>
> 10.2 This Hon'ble Court be pleased to allow the representation filed as Annexure P-7;
>
> 10.3 Direct the State authorities to reimburse of recovered amounts despite there being an order prevailing in favour of petitioner in pursuance of WPS No. 2968/2017,
>
> 10.4 Direct the respondent authorities to make payments of Arrears of 5th pay commission,
>
> 10.5 Direct the State Authorities to release the withheld amount of Rs. 2,42,485 to the Petitioner with interest @ 12% p.a. in all above entitlements.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present writ petition has been filed challenging the order dated Annexure P-1, whereby the Pension Dispute Redressal Committee has rejected the petitioner's claim for refund of Rs. 1,22,784/-, which was recovered from his General Provident Fund (GPF) account on the ground that an amount of Rs. 91,500/- had been withdrawn in excess of the balance reflected in the petitioner's GPF passbook. Learned counsel further submits that the notice issued for recovery of the aforesaid amount was quashed by this Court vide order dated 18.05.2018 passed in WPS No. 2968 of 2017, along with a batch of connected matters. However, despite the aforesaid order passed by this Court, the Pension Dispute Redressal Committee has proceeded to decide the issue relating to the recovery on the ground of a negative balance in the petitioner's

GPF account, thereby rejecting the petitioner's claim.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 3 submits that the issue relating to the negative balance in the petitioner's GPF account was examined by the Pension Dispute Redressal Committee. Upon examination of the petitioner's GPF account, the Committee found that an amount of Rs. 91,500/- had been withdrawn in excess of the available balance, resulting in a negative balance in the account. Accordingly, after adding the applicable interest, a sum of Rs. 1,22,784/- was deducted from the petitioner's GPF account, and the remaining amount of Rs. 13,174/- was released to the petitioner towards his GPF dues. Learned counsel further submits that the issue involved in the present writ petition was never adjudicated by this Court in WPS No. 2968 of 2017. The said writ petition, along with a batch of connected matters, was decided by quashing the show-cause notices issued to the respective petitioners/employees for recovery of excess payments made towards salary, allowances, and increments. However, the present case relates to the negative balance in the petitioner's GPF account and is, therefore, distinguishable from the aforesaid matters. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner had subsequently filed another writ petition, being WPS No. 6461 of 2018, wherein, at the request of learned counsel for the petitioner, the matter was referred to the Pension Dispute Redressal Committee for consideration of the petitioner's grievance regarding the negative balance in his GPF account. The Committee examined the issue and passed the impugned order (Annexure P-1). Accordingly, learned counsel

submits that the impugned order suffers from no illegality or infirmity warranting interference by this Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the materials available on record.

5. Upon perusal of the order passed by the Committee, it appears that the petitioner's claim challenging the recovery of Rs. 1,22,784/- was considered by the Committee pursuant to the order passed in WPS No. 6461 of 2018, which had been filed by the petitioner himself. At the instance of learned counsel for the petitioner, the matter was referred to the Committee constituted for redressal of pension-related disputes. In these circumstances, no illegality can be attributed to the Committee in examining and deciding the dispute relating to the aforesaid recovery.

6. The Committee, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the parties and examining the petitioner's GPF account and passbook, found that the petitioner had withdrawn an amount of Rs. 91,500/- from his GPF account, resulting in a negative balance. Upon addition of the applicable interest to the aforesaid amount, the recoverable amount was determined to be Rs. 1,22,784/-. The remaining amount of Rs. 13,174/- was released to the petitioner towards his GPF dues.

7. In view of the aforesaid findings, this Court finds no illegality or infirmity in the decision of the Committee warranting interference by this Court. Accordingly, the challenge to the impugned order (Annexure P-1), insofar as it relates to the recovery of Rs. 1,22,784/- from the petitioner's GPF account, fails.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition, insofar as it challenges the impugned order (Annexure P-1), is **dismissed**. However, in respect of the petitioner's other reliefs, he shall be at liberty to approach the appropriate forum in accordance with law, if so desires.

SD/-

(BIBHU DATTA GURU)
JUDGE

Amardeep