

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19468 of 2012**

=====

M/S Kalyani Agro, G. T. Road, Canserwa, Fazalganj, Sasaram, P.S.- Sasaram,  
District- Rohtas through its proprietor, Uday Shankar Pandey, Son of Deo  
Kumar Pandey Resident of Village- Kailani, P.S.- Dawath, District Rohtas

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

1. The General Manager, UCO Bank, Head Office Brabourne Road, Kolkata-700001
2. The Chief Manager, UCO Bank, Asset Management Branch, L.I.C. Building, Jeevan Prakash, Fraser Road, P.S.- Kotwali, District- Patna- 800001
3. The Zonal Manager, Zonal Office, UCO Bank, Maurya Lok Complex, 4th Floor, Block-A, New Dak Banglow Road, P.S.- Kotwali, District Patna- 800001
4. The Branch Manager, UCO Bank, Anandi Bazar, Branch Office, Sasaram, P.S.- Sasaram, District- Rohtas
5. The Recovery Officer cum Assistant Chief Manager, UCO Bank, AMB Branch L.I.C. Building, Patna

.... .... Respondents

=====

**Appearance:**

For the Petitioner : None

For the Resp.Bank : Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Pandey, Advocate

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN**

ORAL JUDGMENT

**Date: 27-09-2016**

The present writ petition has been filed for a direction to the respondents to grant 60 monthly instalments for payment of the loan/dues amount of the petitioner.

2. None appears on behalf of the petitioner despite repeated calls today.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent UCO bank invites attention to the order of the Debts Recovery Tribunal, Patna dated 25.07.2012 permitting the petitioner to approach the bank with a reasonable compromise proposal supporting with 25% amount within

seven days thereof along with costs and interest as stated therein. It is apparent from the bank's letter 06.09.2012 [Annexure-3] that no payment whatsoever had been made by the petitioner. Learned counsel for the bank, on instruction, states further that the petitioner has since made payment of around Rs. 3.50 lacs to Rs. 4.00 lacs and the total due to the tune of Rs. 22,16,417/- as on 31.08.2016, the petitioner has yet to file any compromise proposal.

4. In the above circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant any relief to the petitioner as sought in the writ petition which stands dismissed.

**(Vikash Jain, J)**

Chandran/BT

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|