

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.151 of 2014

=====

Rajiv Ranjan S/o Late Satya Narayan Singh, resident of village Darmaha
Tola Chintamanpur, P.S.- Kathariya, District- East Champaran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through Secretary Finance Department, New Delhi
2. State Bank of India through its Chairman, State Bank of India having its
Head Office at Mumbai
3. The Chief General Manager, State Bank of India, Patna
4. Regional Manager, State Bank of India, Circle Office, Muzaffarpur
5. Regional Deputy Manager, State Bank of India, Regional-II, Motihari
6. Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Darmaha Tola, Kathariya, P.S.
Keshariya, District- East Champaran

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Javed Aslam, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. N. A. Shamsi (A.S.G.)

For the Respondent (S.B.I.): Mr. Kaushlendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 03-04-2015 Heard Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, learned senior

counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Kaushlendra Kumar Sinha for

the State Bank of India.

Petitioner is aggrieved by a decision taken by the State
Bank of India with regard to shifting of its branch situated in
village-Darmaha within the same village in Tola Kaswa in the
district of East Champaran.

The grievance of the petitioner is that the shifting of the
branch is against the public interest as well as the provisions of the
State Bank of India Act inasmuch as it is against the interest of the
customers. He submits that there are security problems for the
customers and it is considering such circumstances that the

District Magistrate intervened in the matter but that has not persuaded the authorities of the State Bank of India in taking the matter seriously.

While accepting the position that this petitioner has earlier moved in a public interest litigation arising from CWJC No. 7193 of 2013 which was dismissed as withdrawn. Mr. Verma submits that it was for the purpose of availing alternative remedy.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and I have perused the materials on record. Apart from the fact that a situs of branch of a bank is within its jurisdiction, there is no enforceable legal right vested in the petitioner to question such decision.

Further what I find from the impugned order is, that the branch has been shifted to a different locality within the same village-Darmaha.

In such circumstances where the branch of the bank is situated within the same village and the petitioner has failed to establish any enforceable right and taking into consideration that his earlier attempt before this Court raising issues in public interest did not bear a positive result, I am of the opinion that the issue raised is devoid of merit and not calling for any interference.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

S.Sb/-

U			
---	--	--	--