

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.SHYAM PRASAD

W.P.No. 16433 OF 2016

DATED 28TH JULY, 2016

Between:

Anirudh Avadhani

... Petitioner

AND

Indusind Bank,
Hyderabad, CCBG Indusind Bank Limited,
1-10-72, 3rd Floor, Ashoka Janardhan Chambers,
Hyderabad – 500016,
Registered Office – 2401, Gen.,
Thimmayya Road, Pune – 411001,
Rep. by its Authorized Officer, and others

... Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner : Sri M.Janardhan Rao

Counsel for the respondents : --

THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING

ORDER: (per Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy)

This Writ Petition is filed for the following substantive relief:

"For the reasons stated in the accompanying affidavit, the petitioner herein prays that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue an order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring the action of the respondents 1 and 2 in threatening to dispossess the petitioner from his lawful possession and enjoyment of the property bearing H.No. 3-3-53/7/1, Kachiguda, Hyderabad, admeasuring 196 square yards with ground + 1st floor which the subject matter of O.S.No. 500 of 2016 on the file of the V Senior Civil Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, without following due process of law is illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional and consequently direct the 3rd respondent not to finalize the proceedings in D.R.T.Case No. SAIR/774/2014 and to pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble

Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case."

2. Learned counsel, representing Sri M.Janardhan Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner, requested for an adjournment on the ground of ill-health. A perusal of the proceeding sheet shows that the case underwent as many as five adjournments and on 01-06-2016, a similar representation, as above, was made and this Court has adjourned the case on such representation. Apart from requesting for adjournment on 19-03-2016 and 08-06-2016, upon which the case was adjourned, on 13-06-2016, there was no representation.

3. In the light of the above facts, we are convinced that learned counsel for the petitioner is not interested in arguing the case. Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

4. As a sequel to dismissal of the Writ Petition, W.P.M.P.Nos. 20293, 25123 and 28769 of 2016 shall stand dismissed as infructuous.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J.

G.SHYAM PRASAD,

J.

Date: 28-07-2016.

JSK