

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.24149 of 2018

=====

Baldeo Prasad Gupta- Karta of a Joint Hindu Family, Age 73 year, son of late Shambhu Prasad Gupta, R/o Village and post office and police Station at -Karmatar, District-Jamtara (Jharkhand), formerly working as Senior J M Grade I officer in Bank of India, Presently stay at Patna, 106B Maha Laxmi Apartment, E.B. Canal Road, Patna 800001 (Bihar).. Mob No. 8084866810

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1.The Chairman Cum Managing Director, Bank Of India.
 - 2.The Executive Director cum Review Authority, Bank of India.
 - 3.The General Manager cum Appellate Authority, Bank of India.
- Address: Head Office, Star House, Banddra,-Kurla complex, Bandra (East) Mumbai 400051. (of above three)
- 4.The Zonal Manager cum Disciplinary Authority, Bank of India, The Zonal Office, Chanakya Palace, Ist Floor, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna-800001.
 - 5.The Branch Managers, Deheri on Sone, Giridih, Sindri and Patna (main)C/O Bank of India, P.O.-Deheri on Sone, Dist-Rohtas (Bihar)
 - 6.ICICI Prudential Life Insurance co. Ltd, through its The Chairman cum Managing Director, corporate/Head Office, ICICI Prulife Tower, Appasaheb Marg, Prabhdevi, Mumbai-400025.
 - 7.The Branch Manager/Incharge, ICICI Prudential Life Insurance Co. Ltd. Patna Branch, Uma Complex, 4th Floor, Frazer Road, Near-Door Darsh Kendra, Patna-800001.
 8. ICICI Prudential Mutual Fund Co. Ltd, Through its The Chairman cum Managing Directorand all concerns, Corporate/Regd office, One BKC Wing, 13 Floor, Bandra-Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai-400051.
 - 9.The Branch Manager/In-charge, ICICI Prudential Life Insurance Co. Ltd. Patna Branch, 1st Floor, Kashi Place, Near-Dabbangala Chowk/Mouriya complex, Patna-800001.
 - 10.ICICI Bank Ltd, Through its the Chairman cum Managing Director, Head Office, ICICI Bank Bandra-Kurla complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai-400051.
 - 11.The Branch Manager, ICICI Bank, C/o ICICI Bank, Boring Road Branch, Near Boring Road Chowraha, Patna-800001.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Baldeo Prasad Gupta (In Person)
For the Bank of India (Respondent No.1): Mr. Rupak Kumar, Adv

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 04-01-2019 Heard the petitioner in person and learned counsel
representing the respondent no.1.

This writ application has been preferred seeking a



direction from this Court to the respondent-Bank to pay the petitioner all such amounts which are lying in deposits in the Bank Accounts then existing in the name of his family members and other relatives. Although, the narration of facts in this writ application are not very clear but what transpired in course of submissions make this much clear that the petitioner himself was an employee of the Bank of India from where certain charges against him of carrying some interpolations in the Bank Accounts and he was proceeded against for the charges of certain omissions and commissions. In a regular departmental inquiry the charges were found proved which led to dismissal of the petitioner. The order of dismissal was challenged before this Court but the challenge failed even the Letters Patent Appeal and Special Leave Petition preferred by the petitioner were dismissed. The accounts were seized vide order dated 26.12.1991.

The petitioner, who appears in person, is now calling upon for a direction from this Court to the Respondent-Bank to pay the amount shown in the accounts.

Mr. Rupak Kumar, learned counsel representing the Bank has informed this Court that the petitioner is in habit of filing repeated applications of this nature and on many



occasions he has been warned by the Court for his misconceived attempts in filing frivolous applications. Learned counsel submits that, in fact, the charges against the petitioner were that of carrying interpolations in the Bank Accounts and for that he was dismissed from service.

In the given facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no relief may be granted to the petitioner in exercise of power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

The writ application has no merit and is, accordingly, dismissed.

So far as grievance of the petitioner against the Insurance Companies are concerned, if there is any deficiency in service on the part of the Insurance Companies, the remedy of the petitioner would lie elsewhere under appropriate jurisdiction before an appropriate forum.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

R.R.Ojha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

