

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.662 of 2015

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 15791 of 2012

=====

Md. Saleem Rizvi son of Late Md. Nayeem resident of Mohalla - Hotel Daizy 6 Complex, Dariyapur Road, Baripath, P.S. - Pirmahore, District - Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. Mr. Prasant Kumar , the Branch Manager , H. D. F. C. Bank Ltd., Ram Plaza, 2nd Floor, Exhibition Road, Patna - 1.
2. Mr. Vijay Pratap Tiwary, the Assistant General Manager, State Bank of India, Stressed Asstt. Resolution Branch, Main Branch Building S.B.I., Patna - 1.
3. Mr. Laxman Sahu, the Branch Manager, Punjab and Sindh Bank, Hajiganj, Patna City, Bihar.

.... Opp. Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sahvind Kumar Sharma, Advocate
For the HDFC Bank : Mr. Amaresh Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For ARCIL : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-11-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the HDFC Bank. No one appears for the State Bank although Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate makes a submission that the assets in question have been assigned by the State Bank to the Assets Reconstruction Company Limited, which he represents, and which has filed a modification petition with respect to the order dated 7.5.2014 under contempt.

From a perusal of the contempt petition it appears that the only grievance of the petitioner is with regard to the valuation put by the two valuers of the State Bank and the HDFC Bank whose valuations are to the extent of Rs. 4,16,01,001/- and Rs.3,80,24,805/- respectively, whereas the valuer appointed by the petitioner has given the market valuation of the property at



Rs.7,23,45,000/-. It is further stated that the State Bank has appointed a second valuer who has valued the property at Rs.3,85,76,200/-, which, according to the petitioner, is much lower than the value assessed by the valuer of the petitioner.

This Court fails to understand how the valuation report putting the valuation as low and not acceptable to the petitioner amounts to violation of the order of this Court.

In the aforesaid circumstances, the contempt application is wholly misconceived. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

spal/-

U			
---	--	--	--

