IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(L). No. 428 of 2011

State Bank of India … … **...Petitioner**

-Versus-

Union of India & Anr. ... …. …**Respondents**

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DR. S.N.PATHAK
(Through: Video Conferencing)

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Resp. No. 2 : Ms. Srija Choudhury, Advocate

8/ 29.06.2020 In view of outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, case has been taken up through Video Conferencing. Concerned lawyers have no objection with regard to the proceeding, which has been held through Video Conferencing today at 10:30 A.M. onwards. They have no complaint in respect to the audio and video clarity and quality.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

It has been submitted by Ms. Srija Choudhury, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No. 2-workman, that this Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 15.02.2017, while rejecting the stay petition, observed that petitioner-management would act in terms of the Award. Further, a direction was given to respondent-workman to submit an indemnity bond before the Management and if the petitioner succeed, the workman will have to refund the amount paid in consequence of the impugned order. Ms. Srija Choudhury further argues that order of this Court has not been complied with in toto.

On the other hand, Mr. Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner-Bank submits that being conscious of the order dated 15.02.2017 passed by this Court, the petitioner-SBI has taken every steps to comply the order. However, no affidavit has been filed to that effect.

In view of submissions made by the parties, this Court direct the petitioner-Bank to file specific affidavit as to how much amount has been paid to the workman.

Put-up this case after six weeks, under the same heading.

(Dr. S.N. Pathak, J.)

Kunal/