

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 1079 OF 2020**

- Rajesh Kumar Agrahari, S/o Late Shri Gajahari Prasad Gupta, aged about 43 years, R/o opposite Bajaj Showroom, Bilaspur Road, Karagi Road, Kota, District Bilaspur (CG)

... Petitioner**versus**

1. The Manager, Manappuram Finance Ltd., Kanakia Wall Street, B Wing, 3rd Floor, Andheri, Kurla Road, Mumbai, PIN 400093, Maharashtra (India)
2. The Branch Manager, Manappuram Finance Ltd., Sindhi Colony Road, Mungeli Road, Bilaspur (CG)
3. The Branch Manager, Hinduja Finance Ltd., Viyapar Vihar, Shma Tower, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (CG)
4. Union of India, through Chief Manager-in-Charge, Reserve Bank of India, 21st Floor, Central Office Building, Shahid Bhagat Singh Road, Mumbai, Maharashtra 400001

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Aditya Tiwari, Advocate.
For Respondent No.4	:	Mr. Himanshu Pandey, Advocate, under instructions of Mr. B. Gopa Kumar, A.S.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****26/05/2020**

1. Grievance of the Petitioner seems to be the correspondence dated 11.5.2020 made by Respondents No. 1 to 4 – Finance Company in respect of clearance of loan which the Petitioner had taken for the purchase of Truck.
2. Contention of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner is that the Respondent - Finance Company is bound by the circular dated 27.3.2020 issued by Respondent No.4 - Reserve Bank of India wherein they have given certain regulatory package on account of lockdown situation in the country because of the effect of COVID-19.
3. A plain perusal of the impugned order dated 11.5.2020 (Annexure P-1) does not show any specific direction which the Respondents have issued to the Petitioner nor is there any adverse order passed against the Petitioner till date.
4. Given the said fact, let the Petitioner approach the Respondents No. 1 to 4 by making a detailed representation along with the circular dated 27.3.2020 of the Reserve Bank of India and seek appropriate remedial measures. Respondents No. 1 to 4 also are expected to take a decision on the same at the earliest. The

Petitioner would, however, have the liberty to approach the Court again in the event of any detrimental action is taken by the Respondents against him.

5. The Writ Petition accordingly stands disposed of with the aforesaid observation.

/Sharad/

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE