

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.24408 of 2013

=====

Yogendra Mehta, son of Late Kishun Dayal Mehta Resident Of Village -
Raghnia, P.O. Ramganj, P.S. Kumarkhand, District - Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Regional Manager State Bank Of India, Purnea.
2. Branch Manager, State Bank Of India Murliganj, Branch Madhepura .

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dinesh Prasad Verma, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kaushlendra Kumar Sinha, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY
ORAL ORDER

5 18-08-2023 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the
following reliefs:-

- (i) For a direction to the respondents to provide information regarding the payment of entire/total loan as per the one Time Settlement (OTS) Scheme. The petitioner is ready to pay the agriculture loan amount under the One Time Settlement (OTS) Scheme.
- (ii) For a direction to the respondents not to take coercive action against the petitioner till the settlement under OTS Scheme.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has stated
that the petitioner has availed the loan for the purpose of
purchasing a tractor and thereafter the petitioner could not



repay the amounts in time. Even though the Respondent-Bank has floated many schemes for one time settlement of the loans, the same has not been extended to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks a direction from this Court to direct the Respondent-Bank to extend the One Time Settlement (OTS) Scheme.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel for the respondents has stated that the petitioner basing on the news item has filed the present writ petition without there being any cause of action. That as a matter of fact, the petitioner should specifically state under which OTS Scheme he is eligible to apply and in the absence of any such details, the OTS Scheme cannot be extended to the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel has stated that the OTS scheme which was extended by the authorities has already expired and as on date there is no other OTS Scheme in operation and therefore prays this Court to dismiss the present writ petition.

7. Having regard to the above made submissions, this court does not find any merit in the present writ petition which warrants any interference by this Court under Article



226 of the Constitution of India. The writ petition is bereft of any details of the OTS Scheme floated by the Respondent-Bank which can be extended to the petitioner. In absence of any details, no relief can be granted by this Court. The writ petition accordingly dismissed. However, in case the Respondent-Bank floats any OTS scheme and the petitioner applies under the said scheme, the same shall be considered by the respondents on its own merits.

8. With the above observations, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)

shakir/-

U			
---	--	--	--

