

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO.8577 OF 2023

Jan Shikshan Sanshan Aurangabad
PTR No.F-1134, through its
Member Secretary and Executive Director,
Dr Satish Sampatlal Surana

Petitioner

Versus

The Chief Manager, State Bank of India
and other

Respondents

Shri P.B. Shirsath, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri R.R. Bangar, Standing counsel for Respondent Nos.4 and 5.

**CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR, ACTING CJ &
S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.**

DATE : 24 JULY 2023.

PER COURT :-

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The petitioner before us is making a grievance that Respondent-Bank has refused to permit the petitioner to open Zero Balance account, which is a mandatory requirement in view of the directions issued by the Central Government/State Government.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the reason for refusing to open the account given by the Respondent-

Bank is that already exists account in the same name. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this confusion arising from same name of two institutions that has been concluded by the order passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.6604 of 2011, which arise from a Civil Suit.

4. We, however, do not find that the petitioner has placed this judicial order before the Bank.

5. Considering this position, we permit the petitioner to bring the order passed by the learned single Judge of this Court in Writ petition no.6604 of 2011 to the notice of the respondent Bank. Thereupon the Respondent-Bank will take necessary decision as regards opening of the bank account. With this liberty, we dispose off the writ petition.

6. Since we are not issuing notice to the respondent no.6, all contentions are kept open. In case, the respondent Bank feels necessary, the bank would give audience to the petitioner as well as respondent no.6.

7. Writ petition is disposed off as above.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.) (ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)