

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR

TUESDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/12TH KARTHIKA, 1937

WP(C).No. 31986 of 2015 (W)

PETITIONER :

**MINI CHACKO, AGED 44 YEARS,
W/O. CHACKO ANTONY AGNUS VILLA,
KUNJU VEEDU COMPOUND,
PUNNATHAL FRIENDS NAGAR,
THANGASSERI P.O., KOLLAM - 7**

**BY ADVS.SRI.ARUN BABU
SRI.G.HARIPRASAD**

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. CORPORATION BANK,
THRIKKARUVA BRANCH, REPRESENTED BY BRANCH MANAGER,
BHASKAR BUILDINGS, MAIN RAOD, KANJAVELI P.O.,
KOLLAM - 695 002.**
- 2. AUTHORISED OFFICER,
CORPORATION BANK, THRIKKARUVA BRANCH,
REPRESENTED BY BRANCH MANAGER, BHASKAR BUILDINGS
MAIN RAOD, KANJAVELI P.O., KOLLAM 695 002.**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 03-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

bp

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS

- EXT P1: THE TRUE COPY OF THE SALE DEED O.1485/11 KOLLAM SRO
DATED 13/07/2011.
- EXT P2: THE TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 05/10/12 ISSUED BY 2ND
RESPONDENT.
- EXT P3: THE TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER IN WPC 22026/13 DATED 23/09/13 OF
THE HONOURABLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA.
- EXT P4: THE TRUE COPY OF THE SALE NOTICE DATED 15/09/2015 ISSUED BY
THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
- EXT P5: TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 29/09/2015 TO
THE 2ND RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.S.TO JUDGE

bp

A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR, J.

W.P.(C).NO.31986 OF 2015 (W)

Dated this the 3rd day of November, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner, who is aggrieved by the steps taken by the respondent Bank for realisation of the loan amounts defaulted by her, has approached this Court seeking a direction against the respondent Bank to permit her to regularise the defaulted loan amounts.

When the matter came up for orders today, it is submitted by counsel for the petitioner that the directions in Ext.P3 judgment, which was passed by this Court on an earlier occasion when the petitioner had approached this Court seeking a similar relief, have not been complied with, save in respect of one of the loans that was the subject matter in that writ petition. Taking note of the said submission of counsel for the petitioner, I am of the view that the petitioner cannot aspire for any discretionary relief from this Court in these proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Accordingly, the writ petition fails, and is accordingly dismissed.

**A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR
JUDGE**