

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.26691 of 2014

Date of Decision.06.02.2015

Mithu Ram son of Shri Surat Ram

.....Petitioner

Versus

Banking Ombudsman and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. I do not think that any intervention is called for in the writ petition. The petitioner is at liberty to supply such information as has been found to be deficient at the time when the petitioner presented a complaint to the Reserve Bank of India. The petitioner would supply all the details setting forth the particulars of the excess interest charged and the wrong amounts deducted from the petitioner's account. On information submitted, the Ombudsman will take appropriate decision and communicate it to the petitioner. Needless to state that the entire exercise shall be undertaken after affording to the petitioner all necessary opportunities to point out to the deficiencies of the service and the wrong practice alleged to have been adopted by the State Bank of Patiala.

2. With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

February 06, 2015
Pankaj*