

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.1672 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18311 of 2013

=====

Dr. Vivekanand Sharma, Son of Late Satya Narain Roy, Resident of Mohalla -
Adarsh Colony, Kalambagh Road, P.O. Ramna, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The Life Insurance Corporation Of India
2. The Chairman, Life Insurance Corporation Of India Central Office Yogesh
Ram Building, Jeevan Barma
3. The Zonal Manager, L.I.C. Of India, Jeevan Deep Building, Exhibition
Road, Patna.
4. The Senior Divisional Manager, L.I.C. Of India, Jeevan Prakash, Uma
Shankar Marg, Muzaffarpur.
5. The Branch Manager, M.B.O. - II, L.I.C. Of India, Girdhar Complex, Club
Road, Muzaffarpur.
6. Sri Ram Narain Tiwary S/O Not Known L.I.C. Of India, Agent Code No.
0108528, Birdhar Complex, Club Road, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Subodh Prasad

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Dr. Ratan Kumar
Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Abhimanyu Vatsa, Adv.
Ms. Priti Jaiswal, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

2 21-01-2020 Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner/appellant
herein, we find no error with the finding recorded in the



impugned judgment dated 31.10.2018 passed in CWJC No. 18311 of 2013, titled as Dr. Vivekanand Sharma vs. The State of Bihar & Ors., the operative portion whereof reads as under:

“4. Having heard the parties and after consideration of the materials on record, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. The respondents have enclosed the acknowledgment of the petitioner to support their submission that the policy bond was delivered to the petitioner on 15.06.2012. On the other hand, the petitioner has stated that the policy bond was delivered to him by the field agent on 30.07.2012 but without any acknowledgment. The petitioner’s allegation that his acknowledgment dated 15.06.2012 has been forged and that the policy bond was delivered to him much later on 30.07.2012, are all disputed questions of fact which this Court is not inclined to enter into in its extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

5. The writ petition stands dismissed. Needless to say, the petitioner shall be at liberty to approach any appropriate forum including by way of filing a representation before the concerned officer of the respondent -L.I.C. for redressal of his grievance.”

It cannot be said that the impugned judgment stands passed without appreciation of complete material of facts so placed on record by the parties. There is no illegality or perversity therein. The disputed questions of fact cannot be adjudicated in a writ petition. As such we find no reasons



sufficient enough to interfere with the impugned judgment.

Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

sujit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

