

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16568 of 2009

=====

1. National Handloom Industry Situated at Mohalla- Chhaju, Bihar Sharif,
Distt.- Nalanda through its Proprietor Nadim Jaffar, S/O Kamrul Hassan,
R/O Mohalla- Chhaju, P.S.- Bihar Sharif, Distt.- Nalanda

2. Nadim Jaffar S/O Kamrul Hasan R/O Mohalla- Chhaju, P.S.- Bihar
Sharif, Distt.- Nalanda Proprietor of National Handloom Industry

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

2. Principal Secretary, Handloom and Resham, Bihar, Patna

3. Director, Handloom and Resham Bihar, Patna

4. General Manager, District Industry Centre, Nalanda

5. Chief Executive Officer, Handloom and Resham, Bihar Sharif,
Distt.- Nalanda

6. State Bank Of India, Nai Sarai Branch Bihar Sharif, Distt.- Nalanda
through Chief Manager S.B.I., Nai Sarai Branch, Bihar Sharif, Nalanda

7. Chief Manager, State Bank of India Nai Sarai Branch, Bihar Sharif,
Distt.- Nalanda

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Jha, AC to AAG 13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 10-02-2015 Despite repeated calls, none appears on behalf of the
petitioners in support of the present writ petition.

The petitioners have filed the present writ petition
seeking a direction to the respondents to exempt petitioner no.2
from depositing the loan amount.

Learned AC to AAG 13, appearing on behalf of the
respondents, by referring to the averments made in paragraph 14
of the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent nos. 1 to
4, submits that the petitioners have already cleared the dues of the
Bank and got no objection certificate. Therefore, according to him,
the present matter has become infructuous.

Despite service of a copy of the aforesaid counter

affidavit on the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, they have not disputed the averments made therein by filing any rejoinder affidavit.

In above view of the matter, the submission made on behalf of the State counsel appears to be correct.

Consequently, the writ petition stands dismissed since it has become infructuous.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Tahir/-

U			
---	--	--	--