

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

* * * *

-
WRIT PETITION No.22464 of 2015

BETWEEN

India Media Services Private Limited.

... PETITIONER

AND

State Bank of India, Rep. by its Manger, Jubilee Hills Branch, Jubilee Towers, 1st Floor, Road No.36, Jubilee hills, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 21.07.2015

-
SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be allowed to see the Judgments? | No |
| 2. | Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals | No |
| 3. | Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment? | No |

-

-

-

ORDER:

Petitioner appears to have entered into a commercial agreement with third respondent on 05.12.2005. It is now projected by the petitioner that its decisions were based on certificate issued by the first respondent bank dated 22.12 (year is not mentioned) and another certificate issued by the second respondent on 14.05.2011.

Petitioner seeks to know the authenticity of the said certificates and has made representations to respondents 1 and 2 under their letters dated 24.10.2014 and 27.05.2014 respectively. Alleging that there is no response from respondents 1 and 2, the present writ petition is filed on the ground that non-responding to the letters of the petitioner amounts to violation of banking norms, rules and guidelines prescribed by the Reserve Bank of India.

2. After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, I am unable to see any legal right of the petitioner to seek information from respondents 1 and 2, as the petitioner is a third party, who seeks information about the third respondent company. I am unable to see any legal obligation on the part of respondents 1 and 2 to reply to the queries of the petitioner. Hence, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the process of this Court, therefore, cannot be used to fish out information. Hence, I am not inclined to entertain the writ petition.

3. During the hearing, it transpired that the petitioner has already taken up the matter under the Right to Information Act and is stated to be presently pending in appeal before the appellate authority.

The said aspect, though not mentioned in the affidavit, learned counsel for the petitioner fairly states the same. When the petitioner is already before another forum for the same purpose, that is another reason why the writ petition cannot be entertained.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. As a sequel,
the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no
order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

July 21, 2015
DSK