IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14466 of 2015

==

Smt. Usha Devi, wife of Ramesh Kumar Ravi, resident of village Bhagwatipur, P.S. Singhbara, District Darbhanga.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Collector Darbhanga, District Darbhanga.
2. The Branch Manager Bank of India Branch Bedauli, at Bedauli, P.S. Singhwara, District Darbhanga.
3. The Branch Manager Bedauli Branch, Muzaffarpur Zone, Bank of India at Bedauli, P.S. Singhwara, District Darbhanga.
4. The Zonal Manager Credit Department Muzaffarpur Zone, Bank of India at and P.S. Muzaffarpur, District Muzaffarpur.
5. The Zonal Manager Bank of India Chanakya Palace B.C.D. Marg, Patna.
6. The Sub Divisional Officer cum Certificate Officer, Sadar Darbhabga,.

.... Respondents

==

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ram Bali Jha, Advocate

For Respondent-Bank : Mr. Ajay Kumar Sinha, Advocate

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 31-08-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs –

> *"(A) A writ of certiorari for quashing the act of the respondent No. 2 to 6 by which act the respondent have started a Certificate case and notice this regard has already been sent to this petitioner vide certificate Case no. 1/15-16, letter dated 16.06.2015 signed by the Certificate officer, When the petitioner has already deposited the installment but due to dacoity which been committed in the house of the petitioner and the dacoits burnt the Dal Mill and Rice Mill of the petitioner, the petitioner instituted an FIR to this regard about the dacoity and burning of Dal Mill (Pulse Mill) and rice*

WEB COPY

Mill. As also the petitioner has intimated by filing application before the Branch Manager of the Bank. The Bank has taken money from the petitioner for insurance of the Mill, which has been burnt. But in lieu of taking action against Insurance Company Certificate case started if the Bank was insured the Dal Mill of the petitioner, thus the act of the respondent is illegal arbitrary, unconstitutional which should be quashed out right.

(B) A writ of mandamus directing the respondent to pay the entire money which is due with the petitioner of the Bank loan money as the respondent has played fraud with the petitioner who did not insure the Dal Mill in Insurance company has taken money for Insurance installment since 2008 to 2011 from the petitioner.

(C) A writ of mandamus directing the respondent to withdraw the certificate case No. 1/15-16 which has been initiated against the petitioner for recovery of loan or be dropped the case of Certificate.

(D) A writ of mandamus directing the respondent no. 6 to do not take any action against the petitioner without taking proper enquiry, or till the disposal of this writ application.

(E) A writ of mandamus directing the respondent to take proper action against the respondents who have played fraud with the petitioner.

(F) Any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled to".

2. Mr. Ram Bali Jha, learned counsel for the petitioner states on instruction that a compromise has been arrived at with the

WEB COPY

Bank and the writ petition need not be pressed any longer.

3. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	08.09.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

WEB COPY