

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BANGLADESH
HIGH COURT DIVISION
(SPECIAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)

Writ Petition No. 14024 of 2025

In the matter of:

An application under article 102 of the
Constitution of the People's Republic of
Bangladesh.

AND

In the matter of:

OK Mobile Limited

... Petitioner

-Versus-

Bangladesh Bank and others

... Respondents

Mr. Saqeb Mahbub, Advocate

... For the petitioner

Mr. Monjur Elahi Porag, Advocate

...For the respondent No. 4

Mr. Tanim Khan, D.A.G. and

Mr. Dewan Humaun Kabir(Ripon), D.A.G with

Ms. Fatema Yesmin, A.A.G.

Mr. Mehedi Hasan Ronve, A.A.G.

Ms. Elina Chowdhury, A.A.G.

Mr. Sk. Naser Wahed (Shemon), A.A.G. and

Ms. Fahriya Ferdous, A.A.G

... For the respondents

Judgment on: 14.09.2026

Present:

Justice Sardar Md. Rashed Jahangir

and

Justice Md. Ziaul Haque

Sardar Md. Rashed Jahangir, J:

On an application under article 102 of the Constitution of the
People's Republic of Bangladesh, the Rule Nisi was issued on
17.12.2026 as follows:

“Let a Rule Nisi be issued calling upon the respondents to show cause as to why the respondent No. 1 should not be directed to dispose of the application dated 25.11.2025 filed by the petitioner (Annexure-I to the supplementary affidavit) in accordance with law and/or pass such other or further order or orders as to this Court may seem fit and proper.”

At the time of issuance of the Rule, a direction was given upon the respondent No. 1 to dispose of the application dated 25.11.2025 within 60(sixty) days.

By filing an application the respondent No. 4, Shahjalal Islami Bank PLC apprised this Court that upon receipt of the direction of this Court the respondent No. 1 directed the respondent No. 4 to dispose of the grievance of the petitioner by providing necessary information/documents and in pursuant to the said direction (through email, Annexure- ‘3’) the respondent No. 4 provided a statement of account issued on 03.02.2026.

Learned Advocate for the respondent No. 4 continues to submit that as soon as the statement of account as has been provided the Rule has become infructuous.

On the other hand, learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that statement of account as has been provided by the respondent No. 4 does not reflect the true picture of deposition or loan repayment facts and as such he sought for a further direction upon the respondents to issue a correct statement.

Heard learned Advocate of both the parties, perused the writ petition together with the annexures and application for discharging the Rule and supplementary affidavit.

In view of the Rule issuance order dated 17.12.2025, with disposal of the application dated 25.11.2025, the Rule has been infructuous.

However of the contention of learned Advocate for the petitioner that the provided statement of account does not reflect true picture of the transaction, we are of the further view that in that case the petitioner may ventilate his grievance in proper forum if he is so advised.

With the aforesaid observation, the Rule is disposed of.

No order as to cost.

Md. Ziaul Haque, J:

I agree.