

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9133 of 2010

=====

Chistia Khatoon, W/O Late Mohammad Jainul Haque, R/O Mohalla- River
Tola, Ward No.6, P.S. and Distt.- Katihar

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Secretary Ministry of Railway,
Government of India, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi
2. North Frontier Railway through Its General Manager Having Its Office at
Maligaon, Guahati
3. The General Manager, North Frontier Railway Having Its Office at
Maligaon, Guahati
4. The Divisional Railway Manager (Commercial) North Frontier Railway
Station, Having Its Office at Katihar Railway Station
5. Senior Divisional Commercial Manager Katihar Railway Station, Katihar
6. The Chief Commercial Manager (Station) Katihar Railway Station,
Katihar
7. The Chief Commercial Inspector, Katihar North Frontier Railway,
Having Its Office at Maligaon, Guahati
8. The Indian Railway Catering and Tourism Corporation Limited, Through
Its Executive Director Catering Service, Having Its Corporate Office at 9th
Floor, Bank of Baroda Building, 16 Parliament Street, New Delhi
9. The Railway Catering and Tourism Corporation Limited, Eastern Zone
through the General Manager Eastern Zone-3, Koylaghat Street, Ground
Floor, Kolkata
10. Group General Manager Indian Railway Catering and Tourism
Corporation Limited, East Zone, Having Its Office at 3- Koylaghat Street,
Ground Floor, Kolkata
11. The Regional Manager Indian Railway Catering and Tourism
Corporation Limited, Guahati, Having Its Office at 4D, Mandovi
Apartment, G.N.B. Road, Ambari, Guahati

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent nos.1to7 : Mr. Anil Singh

For the Respondent nos.8to11: Mr.Mithilesh Kumar Pathak

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 13-03-2015 Despite repeated calls, none appears on behalf of the
petitioner in support of the present writ petition, though the
learned counsels appearing on behalf of the respondents are
present.

According to learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent nos.8 to 11, the present matter has become infructuous in view of the averments made in the counter affidavit filed on their behalf.

Be that as it may, since none is appearing on behalf of the petitioner, the present writ petition stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--