



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 01.12.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA

W.P.No.16012 of 2020

(Heard through VC)

R.Jagannathan .. Petitioner
(Proprietor Shri Vaishnava Garments)

vs

1.The District Collector, .. Respondents
Thirupur District.

2.The Branch Manager,
Corporation Bank Branch
(Now merged with Union Bank of India),
Veerapandi - 641 605.

Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to dispose of the petitioner's representation / request letter dated 10.08.2020 pending on the file of the 2nd respondent within such time as may be stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.Danesh Balamurugan

For Respondent-1 : Mr.V.Shanmugasundar
Special Government Pleader

For Respondent-2 : Not ready in notice

ORDER

The writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondents to dispose of the petitioner's



representation / request letter dated 10.08.2020 pending on the file of the second respondent.

WEB COPY

2. The petitioner is the proprietor of M/s.Shri Vaishnava Garments. Since he proposed to set up the Small Scale Industry (SSI) unit in the leasehold premises at Tirupur, he applied for loan under the Prime Minister's Employment Generation Program (PMEGP) Scheme and the loan was sanctioned by the second respondent-Bank Authorities. He has promptly paid all the installments to the tune of Rs.9,94,450/- without fail. Thereafter, the petitioner requested term loan of Rs.1,98,00,000/- under the scheme introduced by the Ministry of MSME (Micro Small and Medium Enterprises), for which, he has also deposited Rs.3,60,000/- in the bank as security deposit. Based on the assurance given by the Bank Officials, the petitioner started to purchase various machineries for the purpose of developing his industry. However, the loan amount was not sanctioned. Further, the petitioner asked for overdraft facility of about Rs.25,00,000/- for the purpose of managing Covid-19 situation. But, the same was not considered by the Bank Officials, in spite of providing all the necessary documents, as required by the bank officials. The second respondent-Bank had given credit sanction of Rs.67,000/- by way of an intimation letter dated 28.07.2020. However, the petitioner's request with regard to overdraft facility was pending before the second respondent. Hence, the petitioner has filed the above writ petition.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that the second respondent-Bank had sent communications dated 05.10.2020 and 16.10.2020, rejecting the request of the petitioner.



4. Recording the above statement, the writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. No costs.

WEB COPY

-sd/-

Assistant Registrar (cs)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

rsi

To

The District Collector,
Thirupur District.

W.P.No.16012 of 2020

SV (CO)

UMY (19/12/2020)