

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.792 of 2016

=====

Ranvir Prasad Singh, S/o Late Sanjay Singh, aged about 55 years, Resident of Patna
Gaddi Road, Zeep Garaj, Jay Nagar, P.S. - Jay Nagar, District - Madhubani.

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The Central Bank of India through Chief Executive Cum Chief Managing Director Central Bank of India, Chandermukhi, Nariman Point Mumbai - 400021.
2. The General Manager (P and D) Central Bank of India, Chandarmukhi, Nariman Point, Mumbai -400021.
3. The Zonal Manager Central Bank of India Zonal Office Muzaffarpur.
4. The Regional Manager Central Bank of India Regional Office Dharbhanga.
5. The Branch Manager Central Bank of India Branch Jainagar, District - Madhubani.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Raj Kumar Rajesh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Sinha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 20-06-2017

Delay of 17 days in filing of the appeal is condoned.

I.A. No. 4592 of 2016 stands allowed.

2. Seeking exception to an order dated 01.03.2016 passed by the learned Writ Court in C.W.J.C. No. 8273 of 2013, this appeal has been filed under Clause 10 of the Letters Patent.

3. Appellant was an authorized agent engaged by the Bank in question for procuring deposits under the Central Mini Deposit Scheme as a collecting agent. In the matter of payment of



commission to him and in the matter of payment of interest, certain dispute arose and in the writ petition, the learned Writ Court has evaluated the circulars and orders of the Bank and has decided the matter by holding that the appellant has no right to claim commission at higher rate other than the one provided by the Bank.

4. Claim of the appellant is not based on any statutory rule or regulation. The appellant is not an employee of the Bank and is only a Commission Agent and keeping in view the reasons that weighed with the learned Writ Court for rejecting the claim, we see no reason to make any indulgence.

5. The Letters Patent Appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

P.K.P.

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	28.06.2017
Transmission Date	

