

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2790 of 2013

In
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 4221 of 2012

- =====
1. Binod Kumar S/o Baldeo Jah, resident of Dak Bunglow Road, infront of Subham Enterprises, Proptietor of Samar Medico Agency, P.S- Begusarai (Town), District- Begusarai.
 2. Indu Kumari W/o Manoj Kr. Jha R/o Mohalla- Sarvodya- Nagar, P.S- Begusarai, (Town), District- Begusarai.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The Punjab National Bank through S.K. Sharma, its Circle Head Cum Regional Manager, Circle Office, Darbhanga at Darbhanga, District- Darbhanga.
2. Dr. Jai Govind Prasad, the Manager, Punjab National Bank, Begusarai, Branch, District- Begusarai.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vivekanand Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the Bank : Mr. Kumar Priya Ranjan with Ms. Gunja,
Advocates

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-05-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the Punjab National Bank.

The petitioners claim violation of the order dated
9.1.2013 passed in MJC No. 4221 of 2012(Modification) arising
out of the order dated 29.3.2012 passed in CWJC No.5047 of 2012
by this Court.

By the said order this Court had directed the authorities
of the Bank to unseal the premises of the petitioners on 21.1.2013
to enable them to take out certain documents relating to their



agricultural lands for the purpose of making sale of the same and the authorities were entitled to reseal the premises thereafter. This Court had made an observation that the petitioners must ensure that the dues of the Bank including interest, etc. were cleared to the satisfaction of the authorities of the Bank by 21.3.2013 for which purpose it was held that it would be open to the petitioners to approach the authorities of the Bank for any settlement which may be acceptable to the Bank. The petitioners claim that that part of the order has been violated by the Bank authorities. There was no direction to the Bank to accept the settlement which was mooted by the petitioner, rather only liberty was given to the petitioners to approach the authorities of the Bank for any settlement.

In the said circumstances, there is no contempt of the order of this Court. The contempt application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

spal/-

U			
---	--	--	--