

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.353 of 2024

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18366 of 2019

=====

Ramayan Tiwary, Son of Late Ganpat Tiwary, Resident of Priyadarshi Nagar,
DPS More, Bailey Road, P.S. - Rupaspur, Town and District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Union of India.
2. The Chief Executive Cum Managing Director, Punajb National Bank, Head Office, Plot No. 4, Sector -10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075.
3. The Executive Director, Punjab National Bank, Head Office, Plot No.4, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi- 110075.
4. The General Manager, Human Resources Department, Punjab National Bank, Head Office, Plot No. 4, Sector - 10, Dwarka, New Delhi- 110075
5. The General Manager, PF and Pension Fund Department Punjab National Bank, Head Office, Plot No. 4, Sector- 10, Dwarka, new Delhi- 110075.
6. The Circle Head, Punjab National Bank, Circle Office Anand Bhawan, Rai Kashi Nath More, Swaraj Puri Road, Gaya - 823001.
7. The Circle Head, Punjab National Bank Circle Office Chanakya Tower, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna - 800001.
8. The Chairman, Dakshhin Bihar Gramin Bank, Head Office, Bishnu Commercial Complex, Ashachak, N.H.- 30, Patna - 800016.
9. The Regional Officer Dakshin Gramin Bank, 37/A, A.P. Colony, Gaya, Pin 823001.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Sumit Shekhar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, Advocate
	Mr. Vibhuti Kumar, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 04-07-2025 The petitioner by filing the present application
seeking review of the order passed by this Court dated



28.10.2024 in C.W.J.C. No. 18366 of 2019, whereby the Court having heard the contention of the learned Advocate for the Bank, who placed reliance upon letter no.4/8/6/98-IR dated 27.11.1998 issued by the Deputy Secretary to the Government of India to the Deputy Personnel Adviser, Indian Bank's Association, Mumbai and also letter no. PD/CIR/76/G(ii)/1521 dated 11.01.1999 issued by the Deputy Personnel Adviser, Indian Bank's Association to the designated officers of the Public Sector Banks, has observed that the petitioner would not be entitled to get relief(s) sought for in the writ petition, which led to its dismissal.

2. Mr. Sumit Shekhar Pandey, learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that the letter as noted hereinabove, upon which reliance has been placed by the Bank would not be applicable in the case of the petitioner, as the statutory rules which governs the case of the petitioner is otherwise.

3. Be that as it may, considering the fact that there is no error apparent on the face of the record and any other grounds available for review, this Court is not persuaded with the prayer of the petitioner. However, in case the petitioner is aggrieved with the applicability of the letter, he shall be at liberty to file a fresh writ petition for a declaration of this Court regarding non applicability of the afore-noted letters in the case of the petitioner.



4. With the aforesaid observation and liberty, the civil
review application stands disposed off.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

