

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 20.11.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

WP.No.9897 of 2011
and MP.Nos.1 & 2 of 2011

R.Leelavathy

...Petitioner

Versus

1.State of Bank of India,
Rep.by its Chairman,
Corporate Centre,
State Bank Bhavan,
Madame Cama Road,
Mumbai-400 021.

2.The chief General Manager,
State Bank of India,
Local Head Office,
No.16, College Lane,
Chennai-600 006.

3.The General Manager (NW2)
State Bank of India,
Human Resources Department,
Local Head Office,
Circle Top House,
No.16, College Lane,
Chennai 600 006.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus after calling for the concerned records from the 3rd respondent, quash the order of the 3rd respondent dated 12.04.2011 bearing ref.no.HR:RC:104 and consequently direct the respondent Bank to absorb the petitioner as Marketing and Recovery Officer (Rural) on permanent basis with all consequential benefits.

For Petitioner : Mr.Balan Haridas
For Respondents : Mr.K.Chandrasekar

ORDER

This Court has passed an interim order on 20.02.2017 and it is relevant to extract Paragraph No.3:

"3. In view of the statement made by the petitioner, it is open to the petitioner to make a representation to the respondent/Bank within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order and thereafter, the respondent/Bank shall consider the case of the petitioner to condone the unauthorised absence within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of the said representation to be submitted by the petitioner".

2. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents made a submission that pursuant to the orders passed by this Court, the writ petitioner has not submitted any representation before the respondents so as to consider the same as per the directions issued by this Court. Thus, an inference has to be drawn that the petitioner is not interested in respect of the grievance sought to be redressed. Further, the petitioner has not complied with the earlier direction of this Court.

3. Thus, this Court is not inclined to consider the merits of this writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition stands closed. Consequently connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

Sd/-
Deputy Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

sk

+1cc to Balan Haridas, Advocate Sr.No.82992

+1cc to Mr.K.Chandrasekaran, Advocate Sr.No.82237

sm:8.12.2017

WP.No.9897 of 2011

WEB COPY