

view that the second respondent ought to have given reasons as to why the loan waiver application is not applicable to the case of the petitioner. It is also submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that subsequent to the filing of the writ petition, the petitioner had to close the loan account since there was a threat to auction the petitioner's jewels by the respondents. However, he submits that the petitioner is entitled for refund of the loan amount paid by the petitioner in view of the aforesaid Debt Waiver scheme.

4. In view of the non speaking order passed by the second respondent, this Court quashes the same and remands the matter back to the second respondent for fresh consideration and the second respondent shall pass final orders after hearing the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and in the event of the second respondent coming to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for loan waiver under the Agricultural Debt Waiver and Debt Relief Scheme, 2008, the amount paid by the petitioner towards discharge of the loan shall be refunded to the petitioner.

With the aforesaid directions, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

sms

To

1. The Manager,

State Bank of India
Mettur Main Road, Omalur.

2. The Grievance Redressal Officer,

The Assistant General Manager,
Rural Development, State Bank of India,
Zonal Office, Coimbatore -641 018.

+1cc to Mr.R.Vigneshwaran , Advocate SR.No. 14099

+1cc to Mr.A.P.Srinivas , Advocate SR.No. 13825

W.P.No.12522 of 2013

sv

A.SK(23/03/2020)