

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4977 of 2015

Amrendra Kumar Ojha S/o Late Harisganesh Ojha, resident of A/51, Sachiwalaya Colony, P.O.- Lohianagar, P.S.- Kankarbagh, Patna 800020 working as a Stenographer, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Posted at Sales Training Centre, Jeevan Jyoti Building, Exhibition Road, Patna 800001.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Life Insurance Corporation of India, through its Chairman life Insurance Corporation of India, Central Office, Yogakshhema, Jeevan Bima Marg, Mumbai, 400021.
2. The Zonal Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India, East Central Zone, Jeevan Deep, Exhibition Road, Patna 800001.
3. The Sr. Divisional Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Patna Divisional Office- 1 Jeevan Prakash, Fraser Road, Patna 800001.
4. The Manager (P & IR), Life Insurance Corporation of India, Patna Divisional Office- 1 Jeevan Prakash, Fraser Road, Patna 800001.
5. The Manager (L & HPF), Life Insurance Corporation of India, Patna Divisional Office- 1 Jeevan Prakash, Fraser Road, Patna 800001.
6. The then Manager (P & IR), Life Insurance Corporation of India, Patna Divisional Office- 1 Jeevan Prakash, Fraser Road, Patna 800001.
7. The Administrative Officer (P & IR), Life Insurance Corporation of India, Patna Divisional Office- 1 Jeevan Prakash, Fraser Road, Patna 1.
8. The Manager (CRM) & the Enquiry Officer, vide Charge Sheet dated- 15.03.2014, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Patna Divisional Office- 1 Jeevan Prakash, Fraser Road, Patna 800001.
9. The, the Manager (IT) & the Enquiry Officer, vide Charge Sheet dated- 29.09.2014, Life Insurance Corporation of India, Patna Divisional Office- 1 Jeevan Prakash, Fraser Road, Patna 800001.

.... Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kaushalesh Choudhary, Adv
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, Adv

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MIHIR KUMAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

2 02-04-2015 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

After having argued, this case for some length of time, learned counsel for the petitioner realizes that the impugned show cause notice against which the petitioner

has already filed his show cause reply and in which no decision has been taken by the competent authority will make the present writ application premature.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, has sought to highlight certain aspects raised in the show cause reply after receipt of the inquiry report which according to him has not been correctly gone into in the impugned second show cause notice. While this Court is not going to adjudicate the correctness of the show cause notice, inasmuch as, the petitioner had/has still an opportunity to clarify this aspect by filing his reply in response to his second show cause notice, this much must be clarified that if the petitioner raises those issues before the disciplinary authority, the disciplinary authority will be under an obligation to consider them while passing its final order.

That being so, this application is permitted to be withdrawn with the aforementioned liberty.

(Mihir Kumar Jha, J)

Ranjan/-

U			
---	--	--	--