

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10307 of 2013

=====

1. Chakra Infrastructure Limited, A Company Registered Under The Companies Act, 1956 Having Its Head Office At Chakra Madhumati, 28, Purbachal Main Road, Kolkata, West Bengal Through Its Santosh Kumar, Son Of Mr. Raj Ballam Singh, Resident Of Kaushal Nagar, P.S. Hawaii Adda, District Patna

2. Chakra Multi State Credit Co-Operative Society Limited, Padmarekha, 134 M.B. Road, P.O. And P.S. Nimta, Kolkata State West Bengal , Through Its Authorized Senior Member Of Society Sri Santosh Kumar Son Of Late Kishori Prasad Singh, Resident Of New Kunj Colony, P.S. Bahadurpur, District Patna

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar , Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Bihar, Patna

2. The Chief Secretary, Government Of Bihar, Patna

3. Director General Of Police, Patna

4. Senior Superintendent Of Police, Patna

5. Additional Superintendent Of Police, Barh, District Patna

6. Deputy Superintendent Of Police, Barh District Patna

7. Officer Incharge, Bakhtiarpur Police Station District Patna

8. Union Of Indian Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Agriculture, Department Of Agriculture And Cooperation, Government Of India, New Delhi

9. Joint Secretary To The Government Of India, Department Of Agriculture And Cooperation , New Delhi

10. Central Registrar Of Cooperative Society, Government Of India, New Delhi

11. Secretary Department Of Corporate Affairs, Government Of India, New Delhi

12. Registrar, Companies, West Bengal

13. Reserve Bank Of India Through The Governor, Reserve Bank Of India

14. Security Of Exchange Board Of India (SEBI), Through Its Chairman, Government Of India, New Delhi

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. A.K. Thakur

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, A.C. to S.C.-I

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

5 11-02-2016 Heard Mr. Thakur for the petitioner and A.C. to S.C.-1
for the State.

Mr. Thakur, Counsel for the petitioner, referring to the

order dated 4.6.2013 whereby this Court directed for unlocking the business premises of the petitioner, rightly submits that the application has now become infructuous as no order prejudicial to the petitioner has, till date, been passed.

The application is dismissed as having become infructuous.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

Pankaj/-

U			
---	--	--	--