IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2234 of 2011
With
Interlocutory Application No. 887 of 2012

==

Kalawati Devi, wife of Sri Ram Gopal Prasad, resident of Mohalla- Purani Gurhatti, P.S. Chapra Town, District Saran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Commissioner, Saran Division at Chapra.
3. The District Magistrate, Saran at Chapra
4. Sri Brajesh Kumar, father name not known, Deputy Collector, Saran at Chapra.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Saran at Chapra.
6. The State Bank of India through its Chief Managing Director, Mumbai.
7. The General Manager, State Bank of India, Mumbai.
8. The Zonal Manager, State Bank of India, Patna.
9. The Regional Manager, State Bank of India, Saran at Chapra.
10. The Chief Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Bazar Branch, Chapra, Saran.

.... Respondent/s

==

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar
Md. Hussamuddin Azad
For the Respondent No.1 to 5: Mr. Kamlesh Prasad, AC to SC-2
For the Respondent No. 6 to 10: Mr. Kaushlendra Kr. Sinha
Mr. Sunil Kr. Singh

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 30-06-2015 Though this matter was earlier heard on 15.05.2015 and by the aforesaid order, respondent no. 6 to 10 were directed to file a counter-affidavit/ supplementary counter-affidavit bringing on record the relevant documents in support of their claims that with respect to secured assets actions/ measures have been taken by the secured creditor i.e. the State Bank of India under Section 13(2) and 13(4) of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002.

However, when the matter has been taken up for consideration learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 6 to 10 submits that he has been instructed to inform this Court that the loan account of the petitioner was closed way back on 30^{th} January, 2013 and the matter has been amicably settled between the parties. Therefore, nothing survives for adjudication by this Court.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that despite his best efforts, he has not been able to get instruction from the writ petitioner. Therefore, he is not in a position to dispute the statement made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State Bank of India and its officials. He contends that in view of the statement made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 6 to 10, the matter may be disposed of.

In the aforesaid circumstances, particularly in view of the statements made by Mr. Kaushlendra Kumar Sinha, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 6 to 10 that the loan account of the petitioner was finally closed on 30^{th} January, 2013, the present matter appears to have become infructuous.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of as infructuous.

I.A. No. 887 of 2012 also stands accordingly disposed of.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

BTiwary/-

U			