IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.290 of 2024
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15624 of 2012

CNR No. BRHC010970272024

==========

Vijay Kumar son of Late Jagarnath Sao Resident of Mohalla- Amber, P.S.- Biharsharif (M), District- Nalanda presently residing at- Sharanjiwi at Colony 662/3, Panchwati Nagar, Bazar Samiti, Bahadurpur, Sampatchak, Patna, (Bihar)- 800016,

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank H/O Meena Plaza, South of Museum, Patna.
2. The Chairman, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank H/O Meena Plaza, South of Museum, Patna.
3. The Board of Directors, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, H/O Meena Plaza, South of Museum, Patna.
4. The Regional Manager, Regional Office, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Nawada.

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Birendra Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Suresh Pd. Singh No,2, Advocate

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH

ORAL ORDER

8 06-11-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that during the pendency of the writ petition which was earlier filed by the petitioner, being CWJC No. 15624 of 2012, a disciplinary proceeding was initiated against the petitioner after following due process of law in accordance with the provision of Article 311 of the Constitution of India. Upon conclusion of the disciplinary proceeding, after the

WEB COPY

charges levelled against the petitioner were found to be proved and opportunity of hearing having been given to the petitioner, an order of penalty was passed on 01.01.2014 against the petitioner. The petitioner has not challenged the said order of punishment before any competent authority.

3. In these backgrounds, the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present review application which has been filed against the order dated 19.07.2024 passed in CWJC No.15624 of 2012, considering that this Court had already found the relief as prayed for in the said writ petition to be *infructuous* after punishment order having been passed against the petitioner during the pendency of the said writ petition in the full fledged disciplinary proceeding and the same having not been challenged before any competent authority.

4. On merit also, there is no ground to review the order. Since the petitioner has chosen to withdraw the review application, he is at liberty to avail appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

5. The review application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Sanjay/-

U			

WEB COPY