

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA
REVIEW PETITION NO.19 OF 2025**

1) STATE BANK OF INDIA

To be represented by the Chairman,
State Bank Bhawan, MC Road, Nariman Point, Mumbai 400021.

2) THE REGIONAL MANAGER

State Bank of India, (North Circle) Jagannath Bari Road,
Agartala, Tripura.

3) THE BRANCH MANAGER

State Bank of India, Kunjaban Branch, Agartala,
West Tripura, Pin- 799006.

...Review Petitioner(s).

Versus

SRI MEHESH LAL YADAV,
S/O- Lt. Gobinda Lal Yadav,
Of Khejurbagan, P.S- NCC,
Dist- West Tripura.

.....Opposite Party-**Respondent(s)**

For the Petitioner(s)	: Mr. Prabir Saha, Advocate. Mr. B. Majumder, Advocate.
-----------------------	--

For the Respondent(s)	: None.
-----------------------	---------

Date of hearing and delivery of
Judgment & Order : 06.03.2026.

Whether fit for reporting : YES/NO.

**HON'BLE JUSTICE DR. T. AMARNATH GOUD
JUDGMENT & ORDER(ORAL)**

1. This present petition has been filed to recall/review the Judgment/order dated 07.04.2025, passed by this Court in Case No.WP(C) 777/2024.

2. Heard Mr. P. Saha, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners. There is no representation on behalf of the respondent-opposite party.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the freezing of the account of the opposite party was not done arbitrarily but pursuant to a written communication dated 06.04.2022 issued by the S.I. of Police, ABN TOP under New Capital Complex Police Station in connection with a criminal case registered against the opposite party. It is further submitted that the relevant circulars and Standard Operating Procedure of the Bank governing freezing of accounts, particularly the guideline requiring recording of reasons in the CBS system, could not be produced before this Court earlier due to their non-availability despite due diligence. Counsel contends that the bank officials acted bona fide in discharge of their official duties and in the interest of the Bank and public administration without any personal gain, and that the opposite party has already been allowed to withdraw his pension from the account without any obstruction. In such circumstances, it is argued that the imposition of costs of Rs. 25,000/- each upon the petitioner-officers is harsh and deserves to be set aside in the interest of justice.

4. Having considered the pleadings on record and the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the review petitioners, this Court is of the view that the present petition filed does not disclose any error apparent on the face of the record warranting exercise of the review jurisdiction of this Court in respect of the judgment and order dated 07.04.2025. The documents and circulars now sought to be relied upon were not produced at the time of hearing of the writ petition and the same cannot be permitted to be introduced at the stage of review. It is well settled that the review jurisdiction cannot be invoked for rehearing of the matter or for filling up lacuna in the earlier proceedings. This Court is also of the view that the imposition of costs upon the concerned officers is also relevant to the facts and circumstances of

the case. Accordingly, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the said impugned judgment and order.

5. Accordingly, in view of the above, the present review petition stands dismissed. As a sequel, stay if any stands vacated. Pending application(s), if any also stands closed.

DR. T. AMARNATH GOUD, J

suhanjit

RAJKUMAR
SUHANJIT SINGHA

Digitally signed by RAJKUMAR
SUHANJIT SINGHA
Date: 2026.03.07 16:00:18
+05'30'



सत्यमेव जयते