

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 15.09.2022

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.MAHADEVAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD**

W.P(MD)No.12832 of 2018

G.Sundaram

... Petitioner

VS.

1.The Regional Director,
Reserve Bank of India,
Fort Glacis, 16, Rajaji Salai,
Chennai – 600 001.

2.Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer,
Indian Overseas Bank, Central Office,
No.763, Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 002.

3.The Regional Manager,
Indian Overseas Bank – Regional Office,
Shanmugapuram,
Thoothukudi – 628001.

4.Indian Overseas Bank,
Mudukkankulam Branch,
Rep. by its Branch Manager,
Mudukkankulam Village,
Kariapatti Taluk,
Virudhunagar District.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 3 to pass appropriate orders directing the fourth respondent bank, to continue its banking business at Mudukkankulam Village, Kariyapatti Taluk, Virudhunagar District and render banking services to the residents/villagers for the welfare of the people in Kariapatti Taluk, Virudhunagar District, by passing orders on the representation dated 04.12.2017, within a time frame as may be fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.R.Sathan Boopathy

For R2 & R4 : Mr.N.Dilip Kumar

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by R.MAHADEVAN, J.)

This Writ Petition has been filed for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the fourth respondent to continue its banking service at Mudukkankulam Village, Kariyapatti Taluk, Virudhunagar District, by considering the petitioner's representation dated 04.12.2017.

2. Heard Mr.S.R.Sathan Boopathy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.N.Dilip Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents 2 to 4.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that the fourth respondent bank has opened its branch at Mudukkankulam Village in the year 1989 and about 300 persons maintained their accounts in the said branch. While so, the fourth respondent bank has decided to discontinue its operation in the aforesaid village on its own discretion and aggrieved over the same, the writ petitioner has moved this Court by way of filing this writ petition.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent Bank submitted that the aforesaid branch was merged with the nearby branch due to low number of customers.

5. In view of the above, nothing survives for further adjudication in this matter and accordingly, this writ petition is closed with liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent authorities to have a branch of any one of the nationalized banks. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

[R.M.D.,J.] & [J.S.N.P.,J.]
15.09.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
pkn

W.P(MD)No.12832 of 2018

R.MAHADEVAN,J.
and
J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD,J.

pkn

ORDER MADE IN
W.P(MD)No.12832 of 2018

DATED : 15.09.2022