

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDRA MOHAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/15TH MAGHA, 1936

WP(C).No. 29728 of 2007 (L)

PETITIONER(S):

T.J.THOMAS, PROPRIETOR,
TECHNO COMBINES, VEEKSHANAM ROAD
RESIDING AT THANNIVELIL HOUSE,
THURAVOOR CHERTHALA.

BY ADV. SMT.S.AMINA

RESPONDENT(S):

1. STATE BANK OF INDIA,
ERNAKULAM BRANCH, K.T.D.C.BUILDING, SHANMUGHAM ROAD
REPRESENTED BY ITS BRANCH MANAGER.
2. RECOVERY OFFICER,
DEBT RECOVERY TRIBUNAL, ERNAKULAM.

BY SRI.K.K.CHANDRAN PILLAI SC FOR R1
GP SRI.ABHIJETT LESSLI

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
04-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- EXT.P1 : TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER SENT BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P1 (a) : TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER SENT BY THE PETITIONER TO THE DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P1 (b) : TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER SENT BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT.
- EXT.P2 : TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER SENT BY THE DGM OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONER.
- EXT.P3 : TRUE COPY OF THE NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENT - SALE NOTICE PUBLISHED IN MATHRUBHOOMI DAILY.
- EXT.P4 : TRUE COPY OF IA No.1502/2007 FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE DEBT RECOVERY TRIBUNAL.
- EXT.P5 : TRUE COPY OF THE CONDITIONAL ORDER PASSED BY THE DEBT RECOVERY TRIBUNAL IN I.A NO.1502/2007.
- EXT.P6 : TRUE COPY OF THE REQUEST MADE BY THE PETITIONER TO THE 1ST RESPONDENT BANK.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS: NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A TO JUDGE

vdv

K.SURENDRA MOHAN, J.
=====

W.P.(C) No.29728 OF 2007
=====

Dated this the 04th day of February, 2015

JUDGMENT

No representation for the petitioner today also. The respondent Bank is represented through counsel. I notice that there was no representation for the petitioner on 29.11.2013 also when this case was posted before another court. On 30.01.2015, when the case was posted before me also, there was no representation. It is for the said reason that, I had ordered this to be posted today. It is clear from the above that, the petitioner is no longer interested in prosecuting this writ petition. The writ petition is therefore dismissed.

Sd/-
K.SURENDRA MOHAN, JUDGE

vdv