

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No.6010 of 2016

Ajay Hariharno, aged 41 years, S/o Late Smt. Veena Hariharno, Address Aalok Sadan Ke Samne, New Dipak Nagar, Durg (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

Upmahaprabandhak / Appeeliya Adhikari, Bhartiya State Bank Prashasnik Karyalay, Bairan Bazaar, Raipur (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner: Mr. Ajay Hariharno, petitioner in person.
For Respondent: Mr. P.R. Patankar, Advocate, on advance copy.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

04/11/2016

1. Heard on admission.
2. The writ petition filed by the petitioner challenging suspension and dismissal dated 28-11-2011 was set aside partly by this Court in W.P.(S)No.250/2012 by order dated 20-11-2015 and the matter was remitted to the appellate authority. The appellate authority by its order dated 26-2-2016 dismissed the appeal against which the petitioner had preferred W.P.(S) No.3246/2016 in which this Court by order dated 1-9-2016 admitted the said writ petition and rejected the application for stay of removal from service. Thereafter, the petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking relief that enquiry be directed against the officers and the

employees for doubtful transaction in savings bank account No.30599019299 and also the effect and operation of the order dated 26-2-2016 be stayed and cost be awarded.

3. The petitioner had already filed writ petition challenging the order of the appellate authority dated 26-2-2016 in a substantive writ petition bearing W.P.(S)No.3246/2016 and in that case, the interim relief has already been rejected and again relief claiming to stay the effect and operation of the order dated 26-2-2016 has been sought in this writ petition which cannot be granted as it has already been refused by a coordinate Bench of this Court in a writ petition filed by the petitioner. So far as enquiry against the officers is concerned, that cannot be directed, as such an officer against whom enquiry has been sought is not a party in the writ petition and the relief of enquiry as claimed cannot be granted in this writ petition, as that issue is incidentally involved in pending W.P.(S)No.3246/2016 filed by the petitioner. This writ petition is nothing but a sheer abuse of the process of the Court.
4. Consequently, the writ petition deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed, *in limine*. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge