

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :26.07.2019

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE T.S.SIVAGNANAM**  
**and**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN**

Rev.Applw.No.26 of 2017

M/s. New Chennai Township Pvt. Ltd.  
Rep. By its Authorised Signatory,  
No.4/318, Rajiv Gandhi Salai,  
(Old Mahabalipuram Road) Kottivakkam,  
Chennai - 600 041.

.. Applicant

Vs.

1. The Chief General Manager,  
State Bank of India,  
Chennai.

2. Central Bank of India,  
Rep. By its Chairman and Managing Director,  
Head Office,  
Chandramukhi Building,  
Nariman Point, Mumbai - 400 021.

3. Central Bank of India,  
(Corporate Finance Branch)  
Rep. By its Deputy General manager,  
Addison Buildings, 803, Anna Salai,  
Chennai - 600 002.

4. M/s. Phoenix Asset Reconstruction Company Private Limited,  
Rep. By its Chief Operating Officer,  
Dani Corporate Park, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, 158, C.S.T.Road,  
Kalina, Santacruz(East), Mumbai - 400 098. .. Respondents

Prayer : Review Application filed under Order XLV Rule 1 read with Section 114 of C.P.C. seeking to review the order dated 01.03.2017 passed in W.P.No. 21873 of 2014 and thus render justice.

\* \* \*

For Applicant : Mr. Murali Kumar

\* \* \*

**ORDER**

*[Order of the Court was delivered by T.S.Sivagnanam, J.]*

This review application has been filed to review the order dated 01.03.2017 passed in W.P.No.21873 of 2014.

2. Heard Mr. Murali Kumar, learned counsel for the applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant placed reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***State Bank of India Vs. Jah Developers Pvt. Ltd. [reported in 2019 SCC Online SC 688]*** and seeks to review the order passed in the writ petition.

4. Firstly, the said decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court was rendered on 08.05.2019, much after the order, which is the subject matter of this review application. Apart from that the question before the Hon'ble Supreme Court was whether, when a person is declared to be a willful defaulter, under the circulars of the Reserve Bank of India, such person is entitled to be represented by a lawyer of its choice before such declaration is made?

5. In any event, the applicant has not pointed out any error which is apparent on the face of the record for exercising the review jurisdiction.

6. With the above observations, the review application is dismissed. No costs.

WEB COPY

(T.S.S., J.)


(R.M.D., J.)

26.07.2019

mp/ska

T.S.SIVAGNANAM, J.  
and  
R. MAHADEVAN, J.

mp/ska



Rev.Applw.No.26 of 2017

WEB COPY

26.07.2019