

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3236 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10130 of 2006

=====

Sobhit Int Udyog through its Proprietor Ram Sobhit Prasad, Son of Shri Anand Prasad, Resident of Village- Ajna, P.O.- Gopalpur, P.S.- Kalyanpur, District- Samastipur (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The Union of India through Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Village Industries, New Delhi.
2. Ministry of Agriculture and Village Industries, Union of India, New Delhi, through its Secretary.
3. The Chairman, Khadi and Village Industries Commission Gramodaya, 3, Irla Road, Vila Parle (West), Mumbai.
4. The Director, Khadi and Village Industries Commission, Bihar State Office, Post Office- Bihar Veterinary College, Shekhpura, Patna-14.
5. The Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Central Bank of India, Chandramukhi, Nariman Point, Mumbai.
6. The Branch Manager, Central Bank of India, Andheri Branch, Mumbai.
7. The Branch Manager, Central Bank of India, Fraser Road, Patna.
8. The Branch Manager, Central Bank of India, Birsingpur Branch, Post Office- Birsingpur, P.S.- Kalyanpur, District-Samastipur (Bihar).

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinay Ranjan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. S.D Sanjay, Additional Solicitor General

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 26-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned counsel for the opposite party nos. 1 and 2.

The instant application has been filed on behalf of

the petitioner for restoration of CWJC No.10130 of 2006, which

was dismissed vide order dated 08.01.2018 for want of

prosecution.

It is submitted by the learned counsel for the



petitioner that neither name of the conducting counsel for the petitioner was printed in the cause list nor SMS with respect to listing of the case was received by him, he could not attend the court when the case was called out for hearing in admission matter. Consequently, the writ petition was dismissed for want of prosecution.

It is submitted that there is neither any deliberate nor wilful laches on the part of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the respondent nos. 1 and 2 does not oppose the prayer of the petitioner for restoration of the writ petition.

Regard being had to the submissions made at the Bar, the application is allowed. CWJC No.10130 of 2006 is directed to be restored to its original file.

(Ashwani Kumar Singh, J.)

Sanjeet/-

U			
---	--	--	--

