

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cont. Case (Civil) No. 983 of 2019

Sanjida Khatoon

.....Petitioner

Vrs.

1.Md. Moqueem Ahmad presently posted as the District Treasury Officer, Godda
2.Shri Rajendra Sah, presently posted as the Branch Manager, State Bank of
India, Main Road, Godda

..... Opposite Parties

.....

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE APARESH KUMAR SINGH

For the Petitioner : Mr. Samavesh Bhanj Deo, Advocate

For the O.P. : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate (for O.P No. 2)

: Mr. Kaushik Sarkhel, G.A. V

06 /26.06.2020 Learned counsel Mr. Samavesh Bhanj Deo for the petitioner, Mr. Rajesh Kumar for the opposite party Bank and Mr. Kaushik Sarkhel representing the State are present today through Video Conferencing.

There is a prayer for substitution of the petitioner made through I.A. No. 3564 of 2020, who died on 03.01.2020. Though there are 8 legal heirs named in para 5 of the interlocutory application, but learned counsel for the applicant has made a categorical submission that rest of the legal heirs who are sons and daughter, do not object to the matter being prosecuted by the widow of the deceased employee namely Sanjida Khatoon alone and they would have no objection if any outstanding dues are disbursed to her.

There is no objection to the prayer for substitution from the opposite parties also.

Accordingly, substitution is allowed in favour of the widow Sanjida Khatoon named at para 5 of the I.A. Registry to carry out the substitution. I.A. stands disposed of.

Upon hearing learned counsel for the Bank Mr. Rajesh Kumar and in reply learned counsel for the petitioner, it appears that the revised pensionary dues of the employee have been disbursed through the Bank as per the communication sent by the Centralized Pension Processing Centre, Bihar, Patna. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that perhaps the difference of revised leave encashment is due. Petitioner being a widow may not be fully aware of the actual state of affairs. However, petitioner seeks liberty to approach the competent authority under whom the original petitioner was employed for redressal of any remaining grievance relating to that.

Having considered the submission of learned counsel for the parties in the light of the compliance shown, this Court is of the opinion that no case of contempt is made out. However, petitioner widow may be at liberty to approach the competent authority for redressal of any remaining grievance relating to difference amount of leave encashment due on revision of pension/ pay.

Instant contempt petition is disposed of.

(Aparesh Kumar Singh, J.)