

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.180 of 2015

In
LPA 783 of 2004

=====

Amar Kumar Agrawal, son of Sajjan Kumar, resident of 202-B Block, Hariom Apartment, Exhibition Road, Patna through Ravi Poddar son of Shri Shiv Bhagwan Poddar, Resident of Poddar Palace Muzaffarpur Jawaharlal Road, P.S.- Town Thana, District- Muzaffarpur authorized Power of Attorney holder of Amar Kumar Agrawal son of Late Sajjan Kumar Agrawal, resident of 202, Hari Om Apartment, Exhibition Road, Patna (Bihar)

..... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Industrial Corporation Pvt. Ltd. through its Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Viren Pandey, son of Late Ram Nath Pandey, Factory Bihar Sugar Works at Panchrukhi, P.S.- Panchrukhi, District- Siwan
2. Viren Pandey son of Late Ram Nath Pandey, Factory Bihar Sugar Works at Panchrukhi, P.S.- Panchrukhi, District- Siwan, at present B-6, South Extension, Part-II, New Delhi-110049

.....Petitioners/Respondents/O.P.

3. The State of Bihar
4. The Chairman, Central Bank of India, having its Head Office, at Chandramukhi, Nariman Point, Mumbai
5. The Zonal Manager, Central Bank of India, Maurya Lok Complex, Patna
6. The Branch Manager, Central Bank of India, Siwan Branch, Siwan

.....Respondents/Respondents/O.P.

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Ranjan

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH)

2 20-01-2016 By order, dated 24.06.2015, passed in L. P. A. No. 773 of 2004 and 783 of 2004, we had allowed L.P.A. No. 773 of 2004 and in paragraph 18 we had observed that as the challenge to the proceedings before D.R.T. by the Industrial Corporation Private Ltd. having failed, no order need be passed in L. P. A. No. 783 of

2004 which was filed by Sri Amar Kumar Agrawal who is the review petitioner.

Learned counsel, appearing for the review petitioner, Sri Sanjeev Ranjan submits that D.R.T. is wrongly interpreting the order of this Court and he is not proceeding with the matter of Sri Amar Kumar Agrawal taking the view that his letters patent appeal also stands dismissed.

We only wish to clarify that Sri Amar Kumar Agrawal had not challenged any proceedings as before the D.R.T., in fact, he was the auction purchaser of some of the properties being auctioned by the D.R.T. and certain inquiries in respect thereof had been initiated by the D.R.T. We have not interfered with those proceedings in any manner which have to be continued to its logical end by D.R.T. or its recovery officer as the case may be.

With this observation, this review petition stands disposed of.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J)

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

avin/-

U			
---	--	--	--