
(2016) 10 JH CK 0017
In the Jharkhand High Court
Case No : W.P.(S) No. 5570 of 2016

James Soreng

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Jharkhand

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-10-2016

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (2017) 1 JBCJ 717

Hon'ble Judges : Mr. Pramath Patnaik, J.

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Mr. K.P. Nanda, Advocate, for the Petitioner; J.C. to A.A.G, for the Respondents

Final Decision : Disposed Off

Judgement

Pramath Patnaik, J.— Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are retired teachers of Minority Aided Schools, details of the individual are being shown in the chart given below:

Sl No

Name of the petitioners

Name of the School

Date of appointment

Date of Retirement

1.

James Soreng

R.C. Primary School, Kulukera, Gumla

01.01.1981

30.04.2012

2.

Emilliyana Kullu

R.C. Middle School, Parhi, Gumla

08.02.1982

31.03.2012

3.

Ruben Tirkey

R.C. Primary School, Redwa, Gumla

01.05.1980

29.02.2008

4.

Deonecia Kujur

R.C. Primary School, Loyonkel, Gumla

27.03.1985

30.11.2013

5.

Victor Kujur

R.C. Primary School, Kayamba, Gumla

21.08.1980

30.09.2008

6.

Johany Bara

R.C. Boys Middle School, Banabira, Gumla

18.02.1976

29.02.2012

7.

Manohar Topno

S.P.G. Middle School, Ramtolya, Gumla

01.12.1985

31.01.2016

8.

Mary Margret Soreng

R.C. Primary School, Tetra, Gumla

01.07.1978

30.06.2007

9.

Johnson Kindo

Lutheran Middle School, Panisani, Gumla

18.03.1987

30.04.2016

10.

Jyoti Prakash Ekka

G.E.L. Primary School, Petsera, Gumla

01.12.1981

30.09.2006

11.

Nikodim Tigga

R.C. Primary School, Karam Toli, Gumla

30.06.1979

30.06.2010

12.

Felix Khusar

R.C. Middle School, Parsa, Gumla

28.10.1975

31.04.2010

13.

Domenic Ekka

R.C. Middle School, Hisri, Gumla

20.01.1982

31.05.2014

3. It is the contention of the petitioners that the schools in question are Aided Minority Schools and all expenses towards payment of salary and retirement benefits of the school employees has been funded by the State Government from the public exchequer. The petitioners are also getting pension on the basis of the pension payment order issued by the office of the Accountant General.

4. In the present writ application, the grievance of the petitioners is in relation to non-payment of leave encashment amount on the earned leave outstanding against them. They have also stated that other post retiral dues have already been paid and that salary and post retirement benefit have been paid out of grant-in-aid provided by the State Government.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though, the claim of the petitioners was resisted earlier by the respondent-State Government, but the issue has now been settled in view of the judgment rendered by the learned Division Bench of this Court in the case of Mariyam Tirkey v. The State of Jharkhand and others in W.P.(S) No. 506 of 2013 and analogous cases dated 3rd January, 2014 which has also been reported in 2014 (1) JBCJ 465 and now upheld up to the Hon"ble Supreme Court vide judgment dated 15.12.2014 passed in Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s) 20606-20607/2014. According to the petitioners, the writ petition may be disposed of in view of the judgment rendered as aforesaid by the learned Division Bench and affirmed up to the Hon"ble Supreme Court, by directing the respondents to pay the earned leave encashment amount to the petitioners.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the Respondent-State does not dispute that the aforesaid issue relating to admissibility of the earned leave encashment amount to the teachers of Non-Government/Aided Minority School has now been decided by the judgment rendered in the case of Mariyam Tirkey (Supra) and affirmed up to the Hon"ble Supreme Court.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, in such circumstances, the writ petition is being disposed of by directing the respondent no. 3, District Superintendent of Education, Gumla to take a decision in the matter of grant of leave encashment amount to the petitioners after due scrutiny of their relevant service records and in view of the judgment rendered in the case of Mariyam Tirkey (Supra) within a period of ten weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order along with the representation on behalf of the petitioners.

8. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.