

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3902 of 2003

- =====
1. Samastipur Kshetriya Gramin Bank(S.K.G. Bank), Officer's Association, through its General Secretary, Sri Anant Prakash son of Sri Lalan Prasad, resident of 104, Kaushalya Apartment, Near Gauria Math, Mithapur, P.S. Jakkanpur, District-Patna, presently posted as Branch Manager, S.K.G. Bank, Rewari, District- Samastipur
 2. S.K.G. Bank Officer's Union through its General Secretary Mukesh Kumar "Deepak", son of Sri Markanday Prasad Deva, resident of village- Barheta, P.O. Kudhwa Barheta, P.S. Kalyanpur, District-Samastipur, presently posted as Officer in S.K.G. Bank, Head Office, Samastipur
 3. S.K.G. Bank Employees Association through its General Secretary Shri Aditya Narayan Mishra, son of Sri Chandra Narayan Mishra, resident of village- Bhatgama, P.O. and P.S. Dalsingsarai, District-Samastipur
 4. S.K.G. Bank Employees Union through its General Secretary, Sri Rajeev Ranjan , son of Late Keshrai Prasad, resident of Mohalla-Shastri Gali, Tajpur Road, District-Samastipur

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. Samastipur Kshetriya Gramin Bank through its Chairman having Head Office at Gayatri Complex, Mohanpur Road, Samastipur
2. The Chairman, Samastipur Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Head Office at Gayatri Complex, Mohanpur Road, Samastipur
3. The Union of India through the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance Department of Economics Affairs(Banning division) Jeevan Deep Building Sansad Marg, New Delhi
4. The State Bank of India through its Chief General Manager, Regional Rural Bank Department, National Banking Group Post Box no.12, Mumbai
5. The Assistant General Manager(RRB), State Bank of India, Local Head Office, Patna , Post Box no.103, Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhay Shanker Singh
Mr. Kumar Praveen

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

7 13-01-2017

Sri Abhay Shanker Singh, learned counsel for the

petitioners submits that despite his best efforts, he has not been
able to get any further instruction from his client. He further



submits that during pendency of the writ petition, status of the petitioners as well as Respondents have also been changed.

In view of facts and circumstances, there is no reason to keep the writ petition pending. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

NKS/-

U			
---	--	--	--

