

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20428 of 2019

-
1. Rajeev Ranjan Kumar S/o Amar Kishor Singh R/o Village- Chintamanpur, P.o. - Chintamanpur, P.s.- Pipra, Distt.- East Champaran, Motihari, Presently residing at Saraswati Nagar, P.o.- M.I.T., P.s.- Ahiyapur, District- Muzaffarpur
 2. Gita Singh W/o Amar Kishor Singh R/o Village- Chintamanpur, P.o. - Chintamanpur, P.s.- Pipra, Distt.- East Champaran, Motihari, Presently residing at Saraswati Nagar, P.o.- M.I.T., P.s.- Ahiyapur, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Managing Director and CEO Allahabad Bank, Head Office-2, Netaji Subhas Road, Kolkata-700001
2. The Regional Manager, Allahabad Bank
3. The Authorized Officer, Allahabad Bank, Muzaffarpur
4. The Zonal Manager, Allahabad Bank, Zonal Office, Om Shanti Complex, Opposite Zila School, Muzaffarpur
5. The Branch Manager, Allahabad Bank, Muzaffarpur (Main) Branch, Adjacent to Marwari Vyayam Shala, Saraiya Ganj, Main Road, Muzaffarpur

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dhananjay Kumar Gupta, Advocate Mr. Krishna Kant Singh, Advocate Mr. Alok Ranjan, Advocate Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rajan Ghoshrahe, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

3 15-12-2022 Petitioners have prayed for the following relief(s):-

“I. For writ in nature of certiorari for quashing of the demand notice issued by the respondent authorities in the daily news paper dated 20.07.2019 by which a demand notice has been published to the tune of Rs. 77,49,621.48/-(seventy Seven Lacs Forty nine thousand six hundred twenty one rupees and forty



eight paisa only).

II. For directing and commanding the respondent authorities of the Bank not to take any coercive action against the petitioners.

III. For directing the respondent authorities Bank to allow the petitioners to repay their loan amount within the time as prescribed in the loan agreement?

IV. For any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled under law in the facts and circumstances of the present case.”

After the matter was heard for some time, finding the Court not to be in favour with the submissions made across the Bar, learned counsel for the petitioners, under instructions, seeks permission to withdraw the present petition reserving liberty to take recourse to such other remedies, as are otherwise available, in accordance with law.

Permission granted.

We are sure that as and when any such proceedings are initiated, before the appropriate forum/Tribunal, the same shall be considered and decided expeditiously, in accordance with law.

Needless to add, period for which the petitioners have been pursuing the matter before this Court, shall be excluded for the purpose of computing limitation.

It is made clear that we have not expressed any



opinion on merits. All issues are left open.

The petition stands disposed of as withdrawn with
the liberty aforesaid.

Interlocutory application(s), if any, shall stand
disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

avinash/PKP

U			
---	--	--	--

