

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALEXANDER THOMAS

MONDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF JUNE 2015/8TH ASHADHA, 1937

Crl.RC.No. 1 of 2013 ()

CMP 453/2009 of CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, KOLLAM

SUO MOTU

RESPONDENTS :

-
- 1. THE AUTHORISED OFFICER, HDFC LTD.
VASHGUTHACADU, P.B. NO. 2288, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**
 - 2. MRS. GEETHAKUMARI K., W/O. THULASSEEDHRAN,
DWARAKA, KARIMPINPUZHA, PUTHOOR, KOLLAM.**
 - 3. SMT. SEENA, W/O. SUBASH, CHARUVILA PUTHENVEEDU,
KOTTATHALA PADINJAREMURI, PUTHOOR VILLAGE,
VENDAR P.O., KOTTARAKARA, KOLLAM**

**R1 BY SRI.K.K.CHANDRAN PILLAI SENIOR ADVOCATE
R1 BY ADVS. SRI.THOMAS JAMES MUNDACKAL
SRI.BOBBOY THOMAS
SRI.ARUN ANTONY
R3 BY ADV. SRI.R.NIKHIL
R3 BY ADV. SRI.P.ABDUL RAZAK**

**THIS CRIMINAL REVISION CASE HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 29-06-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

bp

ALEXANDER THOMAS, J.

=====

Criminal Revision Case No.1 of 2013

=====

Dated this the 29th day of June, 2015

O R D E R

When the matter was taken up for consideration today, Sri.R.Nikhil learned counsel for the R3 submits that the entire disputes between R3 and R2 on one hand and other subsisting disputes with the 1st respondent HDFC Bank have been fully settled and resolved to the best satisfaction of the all the three parties concerned. It is submitted by counsel for R3 that the property of R3 was also released by the Bank and the liability of the 2nd respondent (Debtor) was also cleared by R2 Debtor in favour of the Bank and the loan is closed. The property of R3 was also sold off along with the mortgaged property and the money due to her was also paid by the original purchaser who purchased the aforementioned properties of both R3 and R2. The counsel for R3 submits that nothing survives in the matter and the revision could be closed.

2. Senior Counsel Sri.K.K.Chandran Pillai appearing for R1
HDFC Bank instructed by Smt.S.Ambily learned counsel appearing

for R1 HDFC Bank also submits that this matter can be closed as nothing survives for consideration. It is further pointed out by both the parties that the entire proceedings before DRT in respect of this dispute is also closed. It is pointed out by both the parties that the main grievance which led to the impugned Criminal Revision is on account of the proceedings that was directed against the property of R3 instead of the property of R2. The main grievance arose in this revision on account of the impugned proceedings which was directed against the property of R3 instead of against the property of R2 (debtor) as there was dispute regarding the identity of the property of R3 and R2 and that therefore the matter could be closed.

In view of the submissions of both the parties, this Criminal Revision stands closed recording the submissions of R1 and R3. There is no appearance for R2 though notice has been served.

Sd/- ALEXANDER THOMAS, JUDGE

