



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 09.10.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.MAHADEVAN

WEB COPY

W.P (MD) No.22548 of 2016andW.M.P (MD) No.16137 of 2016

Mrs.R.Chandra

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Branch Manager
State Bank of India,
No.17/279-E, Sebastian Mary Tower,
Muttakkad,
Kanyakumari District.

... Respondent

*(Cause Title amended as per order of this Court dated 09.10.2017)
in WMP(MD)No.11332/17*

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondent to disburse the education loan amount of Rs.2,20,000/- to the Petitioner's son for pursuing his B.Sc Nursing Course at Thasiah College of Nursing, Marthandam for the academic year from 2015-2018, within the time period stipulated by this court.


For Petitioner : Mr.T.Lajapathi Roy
For Respondent : Mr.N.Murugesan

O R D E R

This writ petition has been filed, seeking to direct the respondent to sanction educational loan to her son namely, P.Ajin, who is studying B.Sc., (Nursing), on the basis of her representation dated 11.11.2016.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that her husband had earlier submitted a loan application dated 24.12.2014 to the respondent along with relevant documents, requesting to sanction educational loan to her son namely, P.Ajin, who is undergoing B.Sc., (Nursing) and the same was also sanctioned after filing a writ petition in W.P.(MD) No.10756 of 2015. However, prior to the said order, since her husband had expired, the loan amount was



withheld on account of the fact that no legal representatives were brought on record. It is the further case of the petitioner that now the petitioner has submitted a representation to the respondent dated 11.11.2016 along with legal heir certificate for disbursement of the sanctioned loan. Since there was no response on the said representation, she is before this Court.

4. Though the petitioner has sought for a larger relief as above, the learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that it would suffice, if the representation dated 11.11.2016 submitted by the petitioner may be directed to be considered by the respondent in a time bound manner. The learned Counsel appearing for the respondent has not raised any serious objection in giving such direction prayed for by the petitioner.

5. Considering the limited scope of the prayer sought for by the petitioner, this Court, without going into the merits of the matter, directs the respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 11.11.2016 and pass appropriate orders thereon on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. The writ petition is disposed of as above. No costs. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

+ 1 CC TO MR.N.Murugesan, ADVOCATE IN SR No.81970

MK/JC/SAR-1/24.10.2017/2P/2C

W.P(MD)No.22548 of 2016
09.10.2017