

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12701 of 2018

=====

Pradeep Kumar Singh, Retired District & Sessions Judge, Son of Late Radha Mohan Singh, resident of "Geetanjali", Moh - Nalband Toli, Near Children Remand Home, P.S. - Alamganj, Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Bank of India through its Deputy General Manager, Local Head Office, West Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
2. The Assistant General Manager, State Bank of India, Centralized Pension Processing Centre, Administrative Office Building, 4th Floor, J.C. Road, Patna.
3. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, High Court Campus Branch, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mrigendra Kumar and Mr. Apurva Kumar, Advocates
For the S.B.I.	:	Mr. Kaushlendra Kumar Sinha and Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, Advcoates

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 27-09-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and State Bank
of India.

2. The petitioner has moved the Court for the following
reliefs:

"a) To quash the letter no. CPPC/ AGM /Recovery /PKS/85/2017-18 dt. 26.03.2018 issued under the signature of respondent no. 2 directing the petitioner to deposit a sum of Rs. 339198/- paid as excess pension erroneously by the Bank.

b) To quash the letter no. CPPC /AGM /Recovery/2018-19/40 dt. 21.05.2018 issued under the signature of respondent no. 2 informing him that recovery of the alleged excess pension has already been initiated erroneously without informing the petitioner and further intimated him that his pension account can also be with held.

c) For a direction to respondent no. 2 to



revise the TDS of the pension amount which was fixed on the basis of 7th CPC though the petitioner is getting old rate of pension on the basis of 6th CPC.
d) And for other relief/reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled during the course of adjudication which the Hon'ble Court deems fit."

3. After some arguments, in view of the statement made in para-9 of the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that he may be permitted to withdraw the writ application.
4. Accordingly, the same stands disposed off as withdrawn.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	

