

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2825 of 2025

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10090 of 2025

=====

Pooja Kumari Daughter of Raj Kumar Singh and Wife of Ravi Ranjan Kumar
Resident of Vill.- Galchaur, P.S.- Krishnagarh, Dist.- Bhojpur (Ara), presently
residing at Flat No.- 406, Block- B, Pataliputra Heritage Apartment, Gandhi
Nagar, Near Pataliputra Station, P.S.- Digha.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Bank of India through Shri Anurag Joshi, Chief General Manager
State Bank of India, Local Head Office, West Gandhi Maidan, Patna-
800001.
2. Kumari Nivedita, Assistant General Manager, Human Resources/Industrial
Relations Department, State Bank of India, Local Head Office, West Gandhi
Maidan, Patna- 800001.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bipin Krishna Singh, Adv. Mr. Kundan Kumar Sinha, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 06-02-2026 Heard the parties.

2. Application is filed for initiation of a contempt
proceeding against the concerned opposite parties for their
willful and deliberate disobedience of the order dated
07.07.2025 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 10090 of 2025 by a Bench of
this Court. By the order under contempt, the learned Court while
disposing the writ petition has been pleased to observe as
follows:-

*“10. Taking into consideration the
fact that the respondent-Bank
itself wrongly transferred the*



petitioner way back in the year 2021 and the said wrong done by the Bank has been rectified by them after about three and half years of her transfer. Further taking into consideration the fact that in between the petitioner, being a lady, got her marriage with one employee of the bank itself, who is posted at Patna, the guidelines as mentioned hereinabove permit the spouse to be posted at the place of posting of her spouse or nearby place. Thus, on these grounds, I am of the view that this petition can be disposed of directing the respondent-Bank to reconsider the claim of the petitioner afresh and pass a reasoned order.

11. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of. The respondent-Bank is directed to reconsider the claim of the petitioner and pass a reasoned order as early as possible within 30 days from today.”

3. It is the contention of the petitioner that despite the order having been passed by this Court to consider the claim of the petitioner in view of the findings given in the afore-noted order, the opposite party bank has failed to consider the same and pass the so called reasoned order on 30.07.2025, hence in any view of the matter, there is no compliance of the order of this Court in its letter and spirit.

4. Learned Advocate for the Bank refuting the afore-



noted contention submitted that once the bank has passed the reasoned and speaking order, if the petitioner has any grievance, he may assail that order by filing an appropriate application.

5. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the fact that on representation of the petitioner, a final order has been passed by the Assistant General Manager of the State Bank of India. This Court does not find any reason or occasion to continue with the present contempt proceeding, accordingly the same stands closed.

7. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to assail the afore-noted order by filing an appropriate application before the appropriate forum, if so advised.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

