

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

**W.P.(C) No.6384 of 2021
(Through hybrid mode)**

Kishore Ch. Mohapatra

Petitioner

Mr. A. Parida, Advocate

-versus-

***CEO, Central Bank of India and
others***

Opposite Parties

Mr. P. K. Mohapatra, Advocate for bank

Mr. K. K. Jena, Advocate for O.P.4

Mr. T. Pattanayak, ASC
for O.P.6

CORAM: JUSTICE ARINDAM SINHA

**ORDER
05.09.2022**

Order No.

- 05.** 1. Mr. Parida, learned advocate, appears on behalf of petitioner. He had moved the writ petition on 5th August, 2022. He submits, pursuant to the 'go-ahead' given by concerned State department, the bank had issued certificate dated 28th November, 2019 saying, inter alia, it will consider sanctioning loan on the project after joint verification and receiving the subsidy amount. Subsequently, the bank made pre-sanction inspection of the property proposed to be given as mortgage. This happened on 6th November, 2020. After that, the bank did not do anything. In its counter is disclosed letter dated 1st February, 2021, rejecting his client's application, as not fulfilling bank's criteria for approval of the project.

2. Mr. Mohapatra, learned advocate appears on behalf of opposite party nos.1 to 3 (Central Bank of India). Mr. K. K. Jena, learned advocate appears on behalf of opposite party no.4 and Mr. Pattanayak, learned advocate, Additional Standing Counsel appears on behalf of State.

3. On query from Court before embarking on adjudication, Mr. Mohapatra submits, his client would once again approach the bank for sanctioning the loan, on strength of the 'go-ahead' given by State, sufficiency of collateral security etc. More so, because the rejection letter was not received by his client. Mr. Mohapatra submits, there is no objection to petitioner once again approaching his client.

4. Petitioner has liberty to once again approach the bank for sanction of loan on the project. In event petitioner does approach the bank afresh, it will consider and dispose of the approach, within four weeks thereafter. Petitioner also has liberty to produce this order and apply for extension of validity of the 'go-ahead', from concerned department of State.

5. The writ petition is disposed of.

(Arindam Sinha)
Judge