

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11778 of 2019

=====

Sumanlata W/o Late Manoj Kumar, Resident of Village- Mamarakha, P.S.-
Malahi, District- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar.
2. The District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari.
3. The District Treasury Officer, East Champaran at Motihari.
4. The Block Development Officer, Paharpur, East Champaran.
5. The Block Development Officer, Harsidhi, East Champaran.
6. The Accountant General, Bihar, Birchand Patel Path, Patna.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Hemant Kumar Karan, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Anuj Kumar, AC to GP-24
For the Accountant General	:	Mr. Arun Kumar Arun, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 25-02-2021

Learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for
the Accountant General as also the learned counsel for the State
are present.

This writ application has been preferred seeking the
following reliefs:-

- A. To quash and set aside Memo no. 62 dated 21.01.2019 passed by the District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari, as contained in Annexure-6, whereby claim of the petitioner for payment of Gratuity amount of her late husband amounting Rs. 7,55,467.92/-, has been rejected in most arbitrary manner holding that the said amount has been mis-appropriated by Late Manoj Kumar.
- B. Order contained in Letter No. 2017 dated



24.12.2012 issued by the Block Development Officer, Paharpur, East Champaran, as contained in Annexure-2, by which the respondent no. 5 has been ordered to deduct Rs. 7,55,467.92/-, may also be quashed and set aside.

- C. For a direction to the respondent authorities to pay the petitioner the amount of Gratuity amounting Rs. 7,55,467.92/- with statutory as well as penal interest at the earliest, which was payable to the petitioner's husband late Manoj Kumar who died on 07.12.2011 while working on the post of Nazir at Paharpur block.
- D. For grant of any other incidental, consequential or other relief/reliefs, to which the petitioner is found entitled in the eye of law.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the wife of one Manoj Kumar who was an employee posted as Nazir at Paharpur Block under Respondent No. 4. He died in harness on 07.12.2011 after prolonged illness.

It is submitted that when the petitioner was looking for the payment of death-cum-retiral dues of her husband, the Respondent No. 4 took steps for payment but vide order as contained in Letter No. 2017 dated 24.12.2012 (Annexure-2) the Respondent No. 4 directed for recovery of Rs. 7,55,467.92/-. Thereafter, though the Respondent No. 6 sanctioned pension and death-cum-retiral gratuity vide annexure - '4', the Respondent No. 5 deducted a sum of Rs. 7,55,467.92/-. Prior to effecting the said recovery no show-cause was served upon the petitioner. During the lifetime of husband of the petitioner also no notice to



show-cause was served upon him and no departmental proceeding was initiated against the husband of the petitioner.

The petitioner raised her grievance by filing a writ application being CWJC No. 13964 of 2013 before this Court, where upon a learned Single Judge of this Court vide order dated 05.08.2014 disposed of the writ application with the following order:

“The Court surely appreciates the predicament of the present petitioner who happens to be the wife of a Nazir, who is no more. When she demanded family pension and related claims from the respondent authorities, a sum of Rs. 7,55,467.92 was withheld or deducted from the gratuity because certain advance drawn by the husband of the petitioner was not reconciled or accounted for. Obviously, a widow will have limitation in offering explanations as well reconciliation of accounts which was maintained by her husband but learned counsel for the petitioner volunteers to assist the authorities to her best of ability and input which she has or has gathered from source.

In view of the material which was produced along with the counter affidavit, the matter is required to be examined at the local level. The Court therefore directs the District Magistrate, East Champaran that either he or a person duly



nominated by him will go through the explanations as well as records with a fair mind and ensure that the explanation being offered by the petitioner with regard to the advance which is reflected in the counter affidavit is reconciled. The authority in the administration will make an honest effort and not put the blame on the deceased or try to make him an escape goat.

With the assistance and explanation offered by the petitioner, the reconciliation to the extent possible shall be done and thereafter the amount which has been withheld and deducted from the gratuity shall be paid or a speaking order on the issue will be passed and communicated to the petitioner. The Court expects all these exercise to be done within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Writ application stands disposed of with above direction.”

Learned counsel submits that though the writ application was disposed of directing the authorities to make an honest effort and not to put the blame on the deceased or try to make him an escape goat and the entire exercise was to be completed within a period of three months, the respondents maintained a complete silence over the matter and did not proceed with the exercise. When the petitioner filed a contempt



application being MJC No. 1173 of 2017, the District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari came out with Memo No. 62 dated 21.01.2019 reiterating the same amount of Rs. 7,55,467.92/- as the amount liable to be recovered from the gratuity amount of the husband of the petitioner.

Learned counsel submits that the order as contained in Memo No. 62 dated 21.01.2019 is thus under challenge in the present writ application.

The contentions of the learned counsel for the petitioner are two fold. It is firstly submitted that from the materials on the record it is crystal clear that the husband of the petitioner has been made an scapegoat solely on the ground that the vouchers of the different amount were not found by the authorities, though, it is an admitted position which has been noticed by this Court in its order dated 15.06.2020 that the District Magistrate had accepted that in the Expenditure Register a sum of Rs. 20,47,266.87/- has been entered. This Court has also noticed that the vouchers containing the amount have been duly entered in the register and cash book and the same has been signed by the Block Development Officer. Learned counsel submits that there being entries in the cash book and the Expenditure Register which have been



countersigned by the Block Development Officer, in the facts of this case where husband of the petitioner died in course of his treatment non-availability or the missing of the vouchers cannot be attributed to the husband of the petitioner. The husband of the petitioner was suffering from prolonged illness on account of his kidney failure.

It is further submitted that the learned coordinate Bench of this Court had earlier directed the District Magistrate to either examine himself or nominate someone to examine the matter and honest efforts be taken to reconcile and adjust the amount to the best possible extent but the authorities concerned sat over the matter for five years and no effort at all was made to look into the grievance of the petitioner. Only when the petitioner filed a contempt application in the year 2019, hurriedly impugned order has been passed.

Learned counsel submits that the gratuity of the deceased employee cannot be withheld and no recovery out of that may be effected unless it is in accordance with law. Learned counsel has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Jharkhand & Ors Vs. Jitendra Kumar Srivastava and others** reported in **(2013) 12 SCC 210** to submit that any attempt on the part of the respondents to take



away the part of the gratuity without any statutory provision and under an order in form of an executive instruction cannot sustain the test of law. Learned counsel has further relied upon the Hon'ble Full Bench judgment of this Court in the case of **Arvind Kumar Singh Vs. State of Bihar** reported in **2018(2) PLJR 933**. Lastly learned counsel has relied upon a judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Dr. Hira Lal Vs. State of Bihar and Ors.** reported in **AIR 2020 SC 1027**.

Learned counsel for the State has opposed the writ application. After being called upon to produce before this Court all the relevant documents, the Respondent No. 2 to 5 has filed a counter affidavit and enclosed therewith xerox copies of some of the documents. It is their plea that the Establishment Section had inquired into the matter and in course of inquiry the petitioner was called upon to put her case and documents. All this happened in the year 2017. The husband of the petitioner was transferred from Paharpur Block to Harsidhi Block and while it is admitted in the counter affidavit sworn on 07.09.2020 that he had handed over the cash book and pass book, it is the stand of the respondents that he did not hand over the charge of vouchers and according to the respondents the husband of the petitioner had stated that he will hand over the charge of



vouchers on return after his treatment but unfortunately he died.

In the first counter affidavit sworn on 26.09.2019, the Block Development Officer, Paharpur (R-2) states in Paragraph '8' that on unlocking the Almirah the cash book was lying there and the detail of expenditure was mentioned therein for Rs. 7,55,467.92 but the voucher was not found in the Almirah.

In course of hearing, learned counsel for the State however admits with reference to Annexure R/1 and Annexure R/2 to the counter affidavit that the Expenditure Register is containing the details of the various expenditures incurred during the period the husband of the petitioner was in charge as Nazir. The Expenditure Register, copy of which has been enclosed, contains the signature of Nazir, the Accountant as well as the Block Development Officer.

Learned counsel for the State submits that because the vouchers were not available, the recovery has been ordered to the extent of the amount to which vouchers were not found in the Almirah.

Learned counsel for the Accountant General is present and has submitted that the Accountant General has issued the authority slip for payment of the gratuity, however it has not been paid because of the order of the District Magistrate, East



Champanan, Motihari.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the records, to this Court it appears to be a very hard case in which the widow of a deceased employee has been made to suffer for almost ten years for no plausible reason. Her husband died on 07.02.2011 after his prolonged illness. Earlier he was transferred from Paharpur Block to Harsidhi Block but was made to continue in charge because there was no one to take charge from him at Paharpur. This stand of the petitioner before the Inquiry Officer has not been found incorrect. No doubt prior to his death he had undertaken to submit the complete vouchers after updating the same as is evident from the note appearing from Annexure R/1 dated 27.01.2011 but that occasion did not arise because he died only after few days in course of his treatment.

Under these circumstances what was expected from the respondent authorities particularly after the order of this Court in CWJC No. 13964 of 2013 that instead of making the husband of the petitioner an escape goat and harass this petitioner they should have tried to reconcile the records particularly when they were in possession of the Expenditure Register containing the signature of not only the husband of the



petitioner but the Accountant as well as the Block Development Officer as well. There was no reason for these authorities to avoid those documents which were prepared by the husband of the petitioner in ordinary course while discharging his duties in office as Nazir. These are the documents which were worth reliable and till date no doubt has been expressed by the respondents against these documents.

There was a specific direction of the learned coordinate Bench of this Court in its order dated 05.08.2014 passed in CWJC No. 13964 of 2013 to make an honest approach to reconcile the amount to the extent possible. In the counter-affidavit the respondents have not pleaded that they reconciled the account with the expenditure register and cash book, therefore this Court finds that the direction of this Court was not taken care of.

This court would hereunder extract paragraph '8' of the First Counter Affidavit sworn by the B.D.O. Paharpur, Motihari, as under:-

“8. That after unlocking the almirah the cash book was lying there and the detail of expenditure was mentioned therein for Rs. 7,55,467.92 but the voucher of said expenditure was not found in the almirah.”

The learned coordinate Bench while passing the order



had categorically directed the respondents to complete the whole exercise within a period of three months but the reconciliation did not take place for about five years after the order was passed by this Court. It is only when the contempt application was preferred, hurriedly one order dated 21.01.2019 was issued by the District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari reiterating the amount liable to be recovered which was earlier directed by the Block Development Officer vide order contained in Letter No. 2017 dated 24.12.2012. Therefore, this Court has no iota of doubt that these authorities were sleeping over the matter and had no intention at all to act in terms and spirit of the order passed by the learned coordinate Bench of this Court in CWJC No. 13964 of 2013. This approach of the respondent authorities are liable to be deprecated.

This Court finds on records particularly after the direction of this Court contained in its order dated 15.06.2020 that there are credible materials on record to reconcile the amount and in fact a perusal thereof shows that the total expenditures are available on the record.

The report submitted by the District Establishment Deputy Collector contained in letter no. 319 dated 19.02.2018 (Annexure 'R-1') to the counter affidavit dated 07.09.2020



strengthens the views of this Court when the following facts are found in the report:-

“रोकड़ बही एवं अभिश्रव पंजी के अवलोकन से पता चलता है कि तत्कालीन नाजीर श्री मनोज कुमार द्वारा मो0-2047266.87 की राशि अभिश्रव संख्या के साथ अभिश्रव पंजी में इन्द्राज किया गया है, जो तत्कालीन नाजीर, प्रधान सहायक-सह-रोकड़पाल एवं प्रखण्ड विकास पदाधिकारी, पहाड़पुर द्वारा हस्ताक्षरित है। जॉच के क्रम में सुमनलता, पति-स्व0 मनोज कुमार, तत्कालीन नाजीर, पहाड़पुर प्रखण्ड, ग्राम-ममरखा, थाना-मलाही, जिला-पूर्वी चम्पारण को अपना पक्ष रखने हेतु दिनांक-12.10.17 को तिथि निर्धारित करते हुए पत्रांक-989, दिनांक-07.10.2017 द्वारा सूचित किया गया। सुमनलता उक्त निर्धारित तिथि को उपस्थित नहीं हुई। पुनः दिनांक-16.10.17 को तिथि निर्धारित करते हुए पत्रांक-222 दिनांक 12.10.17 द्वारा सूचित किया गया। दिनांक 16.10.17 को सुमनलता उपस्थित होकर इस संबंध में अपना लिखित ब्यान दर्ज करायी कि ;1द्व मेरे पति द्वारा कोई भी सरकारी कागजात घर पर नहीं लाया जाता था और न उस संबंध में मुझसे कभी कोई बात करते थे। ;2द्व जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है वे चार्ज देने के लिए पहाड़पुर गए थे तो तत्कालीन प्रखण्ड विकास पदाधिकारी ने यह आश्वासन देकर कि मैं पुनः आपकी तबादला यहीं करा लूँगा, इसलिये अभी चार्ज अपने पास रहने दिजीए कोई चार्ज लेने वाला अभी नहीं है, जिस कारण वे चार्ज नहीं दे सके। वे बिमार ;किडनी की बीमारीद्व रहा करते थे। एम्स से आए और डायलिसिस के लिए जा रहे थे कि उनकी मृत्यु हो गई। इसके अतिरिक्त मुझे कुछ भी जानकारी नहीं है। ;लिखित बयान की छायाप्रति संलग्नद्व

अभिश्रव पंजी में दर्ज कुल मो0-2047266.87 में से इन्भेन्ट्री में मो0-1291789.95 रूपये मात्र का अभिश्रव पाया गया है। शेष मो0-755467.92 रूपये का अभिश्रव अप्राप्त है। अप्राप्त अभिश्रवों के उपलब्ध होने के अन्य संभावनाओं की जॉच की गई यथा ;1द्व अभिश्रवों को माह मार्च में विपत्र में संलग्न कर आवंटन के विरुद्ध निकासी किया जाना एवं अभिश्रव



पंजी में समयाभाव के कारण समायोजित नहीं दर्ज करना एवं ;2द्ध डी0सी0 विपत्रों के साथ मूल अभिश्रव संलग्न कर महालेखाकार को भेज दिया जाना एवं अभिश्रव पंजी में इसका समायोजन दर्ज नहीं करना ।

विदित हो कि श्री मनोज कुमार, तत्कालीन नाजीर प्रखण्ड पहाड़पुर का स्थानान्तरण, प्रखण्ड कार्यालय, हरसिद्धि हो गया था और वहाँ योगदान देने के बावजूद भी प्रखण्ड नजारात, पहाड़पुर का प्रभार नहीं सौंपे थे, प्रखण्ड पहाड़पुर के वित्तीय कार्यो को सुचारु रूप से सम्पादन हेतु उनके आलमीरा से इन्भेन्ट्री तैयार कर दूसरे नाजीर को प्रभार दिलाया गया था, जिसमें 7,55,467.92 रूपये का अभिश्रव मौखिक रूप से प्राप्त नहीं हो सका था, लेकिन अभिश्रव संख्यावार एवं इसमें सन्निहित राशि सहित अभिश्रव पंजी एवं कैशबुक के थंभजपवद क्मजंपस वाले भाग में दर्ज है एवं तत्कालीन प्रखण्ड विकास पदाधिकारी के स्तर से भी हस्ताक्षरित है, लेकिन भौतिक रूप से मो0-7,55,467.92 रूपये का अभिश्रव प्राप्त नहीं होने के कारण श्री मनोज कुमार, संबंधित तत्कालीन नाजीर के अंतिम वेतन प्रमाण पत्र पर अंकित है कि "इस कार्यालय में प्रखण्ड नाजीर के पद पर थे, नजारात का प्रभार सौंपा नहीं गया। इन्भेन्ट्री बनाकर प्रभार लिया जा रहा है, इनके जिम्मे बकाये की गणना की जा रही है।" तत्पश्चात् प्रखण्ड विकास पदाधिकारी, पहाड़पुर के पत्रांक-2017 दिनांक-24.12.2012 द्वारा उक्त राशि की वसूली उनके भुगतेय राशि से करने हेतु लिखा गया है। अभिश्रव के विरुद्ध विपत्र तैयार कर उसके साथ संलग्न कर संबंधित कोषागार से राशि की निकासी नहीं किया हुआ जान पड़ता है। इस संबंध में निम्नांकित दलीले है :-

(1) नियमतः एक हजार या उसके उपर के अभिश्रवों को मूल रूप में विपत्र के साथ संलग्न करना होता है। विपत्र पारित होने के उपरान्त Paid and cancelled करते हये रोकड़ वही से घटाकर अभिश्रवों की अभिप्रमाणित छायाप्रति संबंधित शीर्ष के अभिश्रवों की रक्षी संचिका में ऑडिट हेतु सुरक्षित रखा जाता है, परन्तु वहाँ ऐसा नहीं पाया गया।

(2) अभिश्रवों की विवरणी निकासी पंजी Contingent



Register में दर्ज होना चाहिए, परन्तु ऐसा नहीं पाया गया।

(3) अभिश्रव duly passed हो वही अभिश्रव पंजी में दर्ज किया जाता है। चूंकि अभिश्रव पंजी में अभिश्रवों की विवरणी दर्ज है इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि संबंधित अभिश्रव उपलब्ध होना चाहिए।

वर्णित परिस्थिति में इस नतीजे पर पहुँचा गया एवं पाया गया कि वांछित अभिश्रवों को उपलब्ध रहना चाहिए परन्तु काफी खोजबीन के बाद भी मो0-7,55,467.92 रुपये का अभिश्रव प्रखण्ड कार्यालय पहाड़पुर में नहीं है। इसके लिए मृतक नाजीर स्व0 मनोज कुमार की जबावदेही बनती है ऐसे में उक्त अभिश्रवों के अप्राप्त रहने की स्थिति में उसमें सन्निहित राशि 7,55,467.92 वसूलनीय है।

प्रतिवेदन सादर सूचनार्थ समर्पित।”

From the above report it is evident that the charge was handed over to another Nazir for smooth functioning of the office and financial transactions, inventory was prepared from the Almirah, it was orally communicated that the voucher for Rs. 7,55,467.92 were not available but in the fraction details part of the Voucher Register and the cash book the vouchers and the amount therein were serially entered and countersigned by the then B.D.O. There is no finding that the Registers and the cash book were containing any wrong entry, rather the finding is that only duly passed vouchers are entered in the vouchers register and because the detail description of vouchers are entered in the Register, the vouchers should be available.

From the materials on the record, it is evident that the



enquiry officer who submitted his report on 19.02.2018 i.e. seven years after the death of the husband of the petitioner has proceeded to opine for recovery of the amount on oral information that at the time of preparing inventory from the almirah, the vouchers for the sum of Rs. 7,55,467.92 were not found. The enquiry officer, has though found that the vouchers/expenditure register and cash book in their fraction details part contains the entry of the vouchers and the amount, the same has been totally ignored without realizing that those entries were countersigned by the B.D.O.

The District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari has simply endorsed the view of the enquiry officer, in his order contained in Memo No. 62 dated 21.01.2019 (Annexure '6' to the writ application).

This Court has perused the entire records which are admitted documents brought by the respondents before this Court on affidavit by way of another counter affidavit sworn on 07.09.2020. This was in compliance of this Court's order dated 15.06.2020. The records speak for themselves. Every detail of expenditure is there duly countersigned by the Accountant and the B.D.O. This Court is of the considered view that the Accountant and the B.D.O. having countersigned the



expenditure register certified the corrections of the entries made therein. In such circumstance, it would not be correct to say that because the vouchers of certain amount were not available, the husband of the petitioner will be taken to have misappropriated the amount, making him liable to pay the same. This is a totally absurd and perverse stand of the respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is correct in his submissions that the gratuity amount of a deceased employee cannot be withheld or no recovery can be made out of that in the manner it has been tried to do by the respondents in the present case. This Court has gone through the judgment cited at the bar on behalf of the petitioner and is of the considered opinion that all those judgments are clear stipulations on the subject as regards the payment of gratuity to a deceased employee. Those will, thus, apply in the present case as well.

In the light of the discussions hereinabove, this Court finds that the Memo No. 62 dated 21.01.2019 (Annexure-6) issued under the signature of the District Magistrate, East Champaran based on the report contained in letter no. 319 dated 19.02.2018 is wholly arbitrary, illegal and against the established procedure of law as also against the terms and spirit of the earlier order of the learned Coordinate Bench. The



impugned orders issued by the District Magistrate, East Champaran (Annexure - '6') as well as the earlier order issued by the Block Development Officer (Annexure - '2') are hereby set aside. In the facts of this case, the respondents are directed to pay the recovered amount of Rs. 7,55,467.92/- with statutory interest up to date to the petitioner within a period of one month from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

This Court has found that the gratuity amount was recovered without any opportunity to the petitioner to put-forth her stand and for ten years she has been kept waiting. After the order of the learned coordinate Bench, for almost five years no order was passed by the respondents but only when contempt application was filed, in the garb of the impugned order (Annexure '6') the same old order was reiterated. This shows inaction on the part of the respondents and complete indifferent approach towards compliance with the order of this Court.

This Court has already deprecated such stand of the respondents. The petitioner who is the widow of the deceased employee has been compelled to contest the case so long one after another before this Court. Therefore, it would be in the fitness of the things, if this Court directs payment of a sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) to the petitioner as cost of



litigation within one month. Liberty granted to the State to initiate an appropriate proceeding against the erring officials who kept the matter pending for such long years despite direction of this Court in the year 2014 vide order dated 05.08.2014.

Such inaction on the part of the authorities of the State which results in saddling of cost by the Court must be realised from the erring officials. In this regard paragraph nos.11, 12 and 13 from a decision of this Court in the case of **K.K. Pathak @ Keshav Kumar Pathak Vs. Ravi Shankar Prasad & Ors.** reported in **2019(1) PLJR 1051** against which Special Leave to Appeal (Criminal) Nos. 003566/2019 has been dismissed by Hon'ble Supreme Court are quoted hereunder for a ready reference:-

“11. This Court would reiterate the observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court in one of its judicial pronouncements in the case of **Lucknow Development Authority vs. M.K. Gupta** reported in 1994 (1) SCC 243 observed in Paragraph 11 as under:-

“11.....Public administration, no doubt involves a vast amount of administrative discretion which shields the action of administrative authority. But where it is found that the exercise of discretion was malafide and the complainant is entitled to compensation for mental and physical harassment then the officer can no more claim to be under protective cover.....”

12. In the case of **Delhi Airtech Services Private Limited and Anr. Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr.** reported in 2011(9) SCC 354 observed in Paragraph 215 as under:-

“215.....The principles of public



accountability and transparency in State action are applicable to cases of executive or statutory exercise of power, besides requiring that such actions also not lack bona fides. All these principles enunciated by the Court over a passage of time clearly mandate that public officers are answerable for both their inaction and irresponsible actions. If what ought to have been done is not done, responsibility should be fixed on the erring officers; then alone, the real public purpose of an answerable administration would be satisfied.”

13. Further Paragraph 218 of the Judgment in **Delhi Airtech Services Private Limited** (Supra) reads as under:-

“218. Principles of public accountability are applicable to such officers/officials with all their rigour. Greater the power to decide, higher is the responsibility to be just and fair. The dimensions of administrative law permit judicial intervention in decisions, though of administrative nature, which are ex facie discriminatory. The adverse impact of lack of probity in discharge of public duties can result in varied defects, not only in the decision making process but in the final decision as well. Every officer in the hierarchy of the State, by virtue of his being “public officer” or “public servant” is accountable for his decisions to the public as well as to the State. This concept of dual responsibility should be applied with its rigours in the larger public interest and for proper governance.”

This writ application stands allowed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rishi/Arvind

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

