

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

* HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND

* THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE J. UMA DEVI

+ W.P.NO.12649 of 2018

% Date: 12-04-2018

Between:

Maddala Ramesh Reddy,
S/o. Maddala Ramakrishna Reddy,
R/o. 8-2-601/B/22, Bhanu Cooperative Society,
Road No.10, Banjarahills,
Hyderabad – 500 028.

.... Petitioner

And

1. The Union of India, rep. by its Principal Secretary, Revenue (Finance & Banks) Secretariat, New Delhi.
2. Central Bank of India, Khairathabad Branch, rep. by its Authorised Officer-cum-Assistant General Manager.
3. M/s. Sudhamsu Exim Private Limited, R/o. 8-2-601/B/22, Bhanu Cooperative Society, Road No.10, Banjarahills, Hyderabad, 500028, rep. by its Managing Director Mr. Y. Ramana Reddy, R/o. Door No.2016, Endicos Country Apartments, Street No.1, Czech Colony, Sanath Nagar, Hyderabad, 500 034.
4. Mr. Bollaraghupathi Rao (Director) (Guarantor), R/o. 10-3-789/3/A, Vijayanagar Colony, Hyderabad-500457.
5. Mrs. Mopuri Rajeshwari (Guarantor), R/o. Flat No.503, 5th Floor, Super Residency, Shaikpet Nala, Adjacent President Garden Function Hall, Hyderabad.

... Respondents

! Counsel for the Petitioner : Mr. Mummaneni Srinivasa Rao

^ Counsel for Respondent No.1 : Mr. K. Lakshman, ASG

< GI ST:

> HEAD NOTE:

? Cases referred

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE J. UMA DEVI

WRIT PETITION No.12649 of 2018

ORDER: (Per VRS,J.)

The petitioner, who was a director in the 3rd respondent Company, has come up with the above writ petition challenging the failure of the Bank in not taking action against the respondents 3 to 5.

2. Heard Mr. Mummaneni Srinivasa Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. Admittedly, the bank has issued a possession notice under Section 13(4) on 01.02.2018 covering two items of properties. These properties do not belong to the petitioner. They belong to the 4th and 5th respondents. Therefore, we do not know how the petitioner is aggrieved. As and when the bank proceeds against the petitioner, it may be open to him to take recourse to law, so that the Managing Director should also be proceeded against if he has personally guaranteed the loan or offered some properties as securities. In respect of a possession notice issued in relation to the properties belonging to Respondents 4 and 5, the petitioner can have no grievance. Hence, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

4. As a sequel, pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

JUSTICE J. UMA DEVI

12th April, 2018
Js.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE J. UMA DEVI

WRIT PETITION No.12649 of 2018



12th April, 2018

Js.