



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 09.10.2018

CORAM

WEB COPY

**THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA
AND
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.KRISHNAVALLI**

W.A(MD)No.1422 of 2014

The Manager,
City Union Bank,
Nagercoil Branch,
Kanyakumari District.

.. Appellant/Respondent

Vs.

K.Lakshmi Priyadarshini

.. Respondent/Petitioner

Prayer : Writ Appeal is filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, to set aside the order dated 30.07.2013 passed in W.P(MD)No.4926 of 2013.

Prayer in WP(MD)NO. 4926/ 2013 :

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a writ, order or direction, in the nature of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondent to grant an education loan to the petitioner for pursuing B.E. Computer Science Engineering Course at Prince Dr. K. Vasudevan College of Engineering and Technology, Chennai, which was approved by AICTE affiliated to Anna University of Technology within the period may be stipulated by this Honble Court.

For Appellant : Mr.R.Pandivel

For Respondent : No Appearance

JUDGMENT

[Judgment of the Court was delivered by
PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA, J.]

This writ appeal is preferred by the appellant/bank, challenging the order dated 30.07.2013 passed in W.P(MD)No.4926 of 2013, wherein the appellant / bank was directed to grant educational loan to the respondent / writ petitioner to pursue her B.E Computer Science and Engineering Course.



2. The learned single Judge while passing the said order observed that fixing of minimum percentage of mark as 85% for grant of educational loan is irrational, unreasonable, unrealistic, arbitrary and capricious. The said remarks of the learned single Judge has resulted in this writ appeal.

3. It is now stated by the learned counsel appearing for the appellant that pursuant to the order passed by the learned single Judge, educational loan has been disbursed to the respondent / writ petitioner and they have also revised the minimum percentage of mark as 75% reducing the same from 85%, which was fixed earlier, for grant of educational loan. He further stated that the costs, which was awarded by the learned single Judge is also paid to the respondent.

4. We have heard the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the appellant and the perused the materials placed before us.

5. We are of the considered view that having acted upon the advice of this Court, the appellant cannot be aggrieved. Hence, there is nothing available for adjudication in this writ appeal.

6. In the result, this writ appeal is dismissed. No Costs.

sd/
Assistant Registrar(AS)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

+1cc to Mr.R.Pandivel, Advocate in SR.No. 89360

PM
AE-DS/RSK/SAR4/15.11.2018/2P/2C

Judgment made in
W.A(MD)No.1422 of 2014
09.10.2018