IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

RVWPET No.281 of 2021
(Through hybrid mode)

Bikramaditya Kar .... ***Petitioner***

Mr. B.S. Tripathy, Advocate

-versus-

Canara Bank of India, BBSR Branch .... ***Opposite Party***

Mr. A.K. Mishra, Advocate

CORAM: JUSTICE ARINDAM SINHA

Order No.	**ORDER** **13.04.2022**
4.	**1.** Mr. Tripathy, learned advocate appears on behalf of review applicant, seeking review of order dated 26th November, 2021 disposing of the writ petition. He submits, even with due diligence he could not point out heading B in the policy guidelines adopted by the bank with regard to implementation of resolution frame work. The clause is reproduced below.

> *"B. Early Re-assessment of the Working Capital limits based on relaxed norms, extended to such MSME borrowal accounts that have already been restructured in terms of MSME Restructuring Circulars issued before."*

2. Mr. Mishra, learned advocate appears on behalf of the bank and refers to page-8 in additional affidavit filed by his client in the writ petition to demonstrate that the credit facility enjoyed by petitioner is in the nature of ‘term loan’ and not ‘working capital’. He submits, relied upon heading B is not applicable to petitioner having facility of ‘term loan’.

3. Mr. Tripathy submits, ‘working capital’ and ‘term loan’ are two names of the same facility. Mr. Mishra draws attention to page-10 in the application and submits, heading-A deals with ‘term loan’, while relied upon heading-B relates to ‘working capital’.

4. Relied upon heading-B in annexure-R/2 of the application clearly was not relevant for the purpose of adjudication of the writ petition.

5. The review application is dismissed.

(Arindam Sinha)
Judge

Sks