

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6088 of 2023

=====

Sudhir Kumar Mehta Son of Jay Prakash Mehta, Resident of Bhawani Nagar
Colony, Bhachhi Madhubani, P.S. - Madhubani Town, District - Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Central Bank of India through its Chairman, Chander Mukhi, Nariman Point, 400021.
2. The Chief Manager, Central Bank of India, Zonal Office, Maurya Lok Complex, Dak, Banglow Road, Patna - 800001.
3. The Regional Manager, Central Bank of India, Regional Office, Patna.
4. The Senior Manager (HRD), Central Bank of India, Regional Office, Purnea, Sneh Bhawan, Bhatta Bazar, Purnea, PIN No. 8543011.
5. The Chief Manager, Central Bank of India, Regional Office, Purnea, Sneh Bhawan, Bhatta Bazar, Purnea, PIN No. 8543011.
6. The Assistant Manager-cum-Presenting Officer, Regional Office, Purnea, Sneh Bhawan, Bhatta Bazar, Purnea, PIN No. 8543011.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ranjeet Kumar, Advocate Mr. Kanishk Kaustubh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Suresh Mishra, Advocate Mr. Ajit Kumar Sinha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

6 19-12-2023 Heard Mr. Ranjeet Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Ajit Kumar Sinha, learned counsel alongwith Mr. Suresh Mishra, learned counsel appearing on behalf Central Bank of India.

2. At the outset Mr. Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on account of inadvertence and communication gap, the order of this Court dated 14.09.2023 could not be communicated to the petitioner, due to which the



appropriate appeal could not be filed before the controlling authority, in terms of the order dated 14.09.2023. He thus prays for further time to ensure the compliance of the order of this Court dated 14.09.2023.

3. Considering the facts that the petitioner being aggrieved by the order dated 23.3.2022 as contained in annexure 4, has preferred the writ petition by invoking extraordinary prerogative writ jurisdiction of this Court, though an efficacious remedy of appeal is available before the controlling authority, the writ petition stands disposed off with a liberty to the petitioner to assail the same by preferring appropriate appeal preferably within a period of 4 weeks from today.

4. In case such appeal is preferred on behalf of the petitioner within the stipulated period, the respondent controlling authority, as would be notified under Section 7 of The Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972, shall consider and dispose of the same by a reasoned and speaking order, in further period of 8 weeks thereafter.

5. This disposes off the writ petition.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

