

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1275 of 2023

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15847 of 2022

=====

Kunal Gautam S/o Vijay Saw @ Vijay Sao R/o Village-Bullachak, P.S.-
Barbighar, District-Sheikhpura.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Bank of India, through Chief General Manager, Local Head Office, West Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
2. The Chief General Manager, Local Head Office, West Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
3. The General Manager, Local Head Office, West Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
4. The Deputy General Manager, Local Head Office, West Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
5. Circle Development Officer, Local Head Office, West Gandhi Maidan.
6. The Regional Manager, RBO (FI and MM), Bhagalpur.
7. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Ramgarh Chowk, Branch (7416), District- Lakhisarai.
8. The Labour Commissioner, Mourya Lok, Patna, Bihar.

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Tarakant Rishi, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 17-05-2024 This application has been listed under heading ‘To Be Mentioned’ on the request of learned counsel for the petitioner to withdraw this application with liberty to file a fresh petition in the same matter for restoration.

2. This Court has perused the order dated 28.03.2023 passed by this Court in CWJC No. 15847 of 2022. The order reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner shall
remove the defects within two weeks



from today.

No one appears for the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the respondent-Bank has shown from the order dated 10.03.2022 passed by a learned Coordinate Bench in CWJC No. 7283 of 2021 that the same issue was earlier agitated by this petitioner, however, the writ application was dismissed after recording that learned counsel for the petitioner could not apprise the Court as to how the present petition is maintainable.

Learned counsel for the Bank, therefore, submits that the second writ petition has been filed on the same issue which is not fit to be entertained.

Having regard to the fact that no one has appeared before this Court to press this writ application, and is said to be of the same and one issue, which has already been considered in Annexure '1' to the writ application, this application is dismissed.”

3. From the order of which recall has been prayed for, it appears that while taking note of the non-appearance of learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court has taken note of the submissions made on behalf of the Bank and considering the same as well, the writ application has been dismissed.



4. In the circumstances, if at all, the petitioner is having any ground to seek review of the same, he will be at liberty to do so.

5. So far as this application is concerned, the same stands disposed of as withdrawn.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

lekhi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

