

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8361 of 2016

=====

1. Arvind Kumar Pankaj Son of Late Baldeo Singh grandson of Late Ramchandra Singh resident of village- Belharia, P.O & P.S.- Tekari, District- Gaya.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Bihar State Financial Corporation Fraser Road, Patna through the Chairman-cum- Managing Director.
2. The Chairman- cum- Managing Director, Bihar State Financial Corporation Fraser Road Patna.
3. The Assistant General Manager (Disbursement) Bihar, State Financial Corporation Fraser Road, Patna.
4. The Deputy Manager, In charge (zone- II) Bihar State Financial Corporation Fraser Road, Patna.
5. The Branch Manager Bank of Baroda Branch-Tekari, Gaya,.
6. Sri Sidheshwar Yadav son of Chotu Yadav Resident of Village Bhalua, P.O- Erkey District- Gaya (Promoter).
7. Sri Mithilesh Kumar resident of Mohalla- Karsilla, P.O.- Tekari More District- Gaya.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Yadav, Advocate
For the Bank of Baroda : Mr. Girijesh Kumar, Advocate
For the BSFC : Mr. Parth Sarthi, Advocate
For Respondent no.7 : Mr. N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 30-08-2017

Heard the parties.

In the present case, petitioner is challenging the order dated 2.11.2015 passed by the Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Bihar State Financial Corporation and also sale order which was conducted in terms of Section 29 of the State Financial Corporation Act, 1951 and sale certificate has been issued in favour of private respondent.



The father of the petitioner and respondent no.6 had taken loan for establishing and running of M/s S.S.B. Dal Mill and Oil Mill at Bzlharia, P.S. Tekari More, District Gaya. As the amount could not be paid by the father of petitioner and respondent no.6, the amount has swelled upto Rs. 1.84 crores as on 28.2.2014. When this amount was not paid the property was put on auction sale. Respondent no.7 was successful bidder and he offered the said amount. Sale order has been issued in favour of respondent no.7.

In paragraph nos. 11 and 12 of the writ petition, petitioner has submitted that he is not in a position to pay the matching amount which has been recovered in the auction sale.

In view of the aforesaid statement, this Court does not find anything in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly this writ petition is dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Vinay/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	4.9.2017
Transmission Date	NA

