

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11130 of 2017

=====

Rajeev Kumar Ranjan son of Ashok Kuwar, R/o Village- Ravi Rai Tola,
Farda, P.S. Naya Ram Nagar, District- Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India through Finance Secretary, Department of Finance,
Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The State of Bihar through its Principal Secretary Finance Dept, Govt. of
Bihar, Patna.
3. Sonalika Kumari, daughter of Ranjit Singh,
4. Veena Pani Kumari, wife of Ranjit Singh,
5. Ranjit Singh, son of Late Rajendra Singh, Respondent nos. 3 to 5 are R/o
Village- Gaura, P.S. Teghra, District- Begusarai.
6. Punjab National Bank Munger through the Senior Manager.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajit Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the PNB	:	Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Vibhuti Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, GP-26

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA
CHAKRAVARTHY**

ORAL ORDER

3 13-05-2025 1. This court has passed a detailed order
on 08.05.2025, which reads as follows:

*“1. The Writ petition is filed to
direct the respondent-Bank to take
proper action against the loanee Sonalika
Kumar, respondent no. 3, loan account
for recovery of education loan of Rs.
4,00,000/- and its interest and also
expunge/replace the name of the father
of the petitioner, namely, Ashok Kumar,
as guarantor to the education loan
account in place of the name of the
mother of the respondent no. 3 i.e.*



respondent no. 4, Veena Pani Kumari, to be substituted as guarantor pursuant to the order dated 21.11.2011 passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court, Munger in Title Suit No. 219 of 2010 filed by the petitioner under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act and also to restrain the respondent-Bank to make recovery from the father of the petitioner of the aforesaid education loan amount taken in the name of the 3rd respondent in the capacity of the guarantor and for any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner would be found entitled under the facts and circumstances of the case.

2. No representation on behalf of the petitioner.

3. It is contended by the Learned counsel for the respondents that the Education Loan Account of the 3rd respondent was closed by the Bank on 09.01.2018 itself and therefore, nothing remains in the Writ petition for adjudication.

4. However, for hearing the Learned counsel for the petitioner, as a last indulgence, list on 13.05.2025.

2. Heard the Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the Learned counsel for the respondents.

3. As the loan account of the third respondents was closed by the Bank on 09.01.2018, and therefore, nothing remains for



adjudication.

4. Therefore, the Writ petition is dismissed
as devoid of merits.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

khushbu/-

U			
---	--	--	--

