

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.24658 of 2019

=====

Kumar Neelotpal, Son of Late Ayodhya Thakur, Resident of Quarter NO. 16/1 (C/o Mr. Manoranjan Singh), Customs Office, Education Colony, P.S. and District- Purnea. At present resident of Flat No. 304, Santosh Raj Apartment, Near Sachidanand Gyan Bharti Model School, Kushai Colony, P.O. and P.S.- Doranda, District- Ranchi-834002 (Jharkhand).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Special Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Secretary, Finance Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Accountant General (A & E), Bihar at Patna.
5. The Treasury Officer, Purnea Treasury, Purnea.
6. The General Manager, State Bank of India, Centralised Pension Processing Centre, Administrative Office Building, 4th Floor, J. C. Road, Patna.
7. The Assistant General Manager, State Bank of India, Centralised Pension Processing Centre, Administrative Office Building, 4th Floor, J. C. Road, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the Respondent/s	:	Smt. Anuradha Singh (SC-21)
		Mr. Rakesh Prashal, AC to SC-21
For the Accountant Gen.:		Mr. Arun Kumar Arun, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL ORDER

6 24-02-2021 Counsel for the Accountant General, State Bank of India as well as State are present. They submit that the present writ application has become infructuous, as the grievance of the petitioner has been redressed.

It appears from the previous order that earlier Mr. Prem Kumar Jha, Advocate was appearing on behalf of the petitioner, but he has instruction not to appear on behalf of the



petitioner and that is why he withdrawn himself from this case. Thereafter, notice was issued by this Court vide order dated 22.06.2020 through ordinary process as well as speed post. The notice was duly served, yet the petitioner has not chosen to appear in this case.

In the aforesaid circumstances, the Court is left with no option but to accept the contention of the respondents that the grievance of the petitioner has been redressed.

The writ application stands disposed of as having become infructuous.

In the event, the petitioner has any subsisting grievance and if any of the grievance has not been appropriately redressed, the petitioner would be at liberty to agitate the same in appropriate proceeding.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--

