

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

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

+ WRIT PETITION No.40325 OF 2018

% Date:09.11.2018

Between:

Parupudi Naga Venkata lakshmi,
W/o.Veeraswara Sastry, Bhupaiah Agraharam,
Amalapuram, East Godavari District.

... Petitioner

v.

\$ The Authorized Office, State Bank of India,
Amalapuram Branch, East Godavari District and another

.. Respondents

! For Petitioner : Mr. M.Sree Rama Rao

^ For Respondents : Mr. M. Srikanth Reddy.

< Gist :

> Head Note :

? Cases Referred : Nil

C/15

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

WRIT PETITION No.40325 OF 2018

ORDER: *(Per V. Ramasubramanian, J)*

Immediately after submitting a reply to the demand notice under Section 13 (2) of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short 'the Securitisation Act'), the borrower has rushed to the Court.

2. Heard Mr.M. Sree Rama Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner. Mr. M. Srikanth Reddy, learned Standing counsel takes notice for the respondents.

3. As against a demand notice, a writ petition is premature. The petitioner has allegedly submitted a reply to the demand notice. Thereafter, the Authorized officer is obliged to pass orders under Section 13(3A) of the Secuterisation Act. It is only thereafter, that the measures stipulated under Section 13(4) of the Secuterisation Act will be taken. It is only at this stage that the petitioner can have a cause of action to approach the appropriate Forum. Today, the writ petition is premature. Hence, it is dismissed.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

J. UMA DEVI, J

November 09, 2018
KTL