



WEB COPY

WP No. 31856 of 2019



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-09-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

WP No. 31856 of 2019

Er.K. Manickavasagam

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Bank of Maharashtra
Rep. by its General Manager,
Credit Monetary, Lokmangal,
1501, Sivaji Nagar, Pune-5

2. Indian Banks Association
Rep. By Its Chief Executive,
World Trade Centre Complex,
Centre-1, 6th Floor, Cuffee Parade,
Mumbai 400 005.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: This writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to communicate the order passed by the second respondent in No. OPR / CIR/Fr/ TPF/ 2327 dated 22.03.2016 to all its Members (Banks) to entrust works regularly to the petitioner, by considering the representation dated 04.02.2019 made by the petitioner, within the period to be stipulated by this Honble Court.



WEB COPY

WP No. 31856 of 2019



For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Chandrasekaran
For Respondent(s): Dr.Sathyamoorthy
for M/s.Shree Law services R1
R2 - No appearance

ORDER

This petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondents to communicate the order passed by the second respondent in No. OPR / CIR/Fr/ TPF/ 2327 dated 22.03.2016 to all its Members (Banks) to entrust works regularly to the petitioner, by considering the representation dated 04.02.2019 made by the petitioner.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that he is a qualified engineer and the first respondent bank had appointed him as a Registered Valuer on 15.04.1999 for a period of three years and the said appointment was renewed periodically and the final renewal was made on 14.01.2004. Thereafter the said appointment was not renewed. When the petitioner approached the first respondent, he was issued a circular dated 04.12.2015 annexing details of third party entities alleged to have committed irregularities as reported by two of its member banks. The first respondent bank had requested the second respondent to include the petitioner's name in the cautionary list of the second respondent on the ground that the petitioner had overvalued certain properties. The second respondent passed an order dated 22.03.2016 in connection with removal of the petitioner's name in the caution list and works have not been assigned to the petitioner. The second respondent did not communicate the impugned order to all its member including



the petitioner. Hence, the present writ petition.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that this Court may issue a directions to the first respondent to communicate the impugned order passed by the second respondent to the petitioner within the stipulated time as fixed by this Court.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the first respondent submitted that the request made by the petitioner will be considered within the stipulated period as fixed by this Court.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on records.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the limited relief sought for by the petitioner, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, direct the first respondent to communication a copy of the order to the petitioner within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, if there is no legal impediment.

7. With the aforesaid direction, this Writ Petition stands disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

08-09-2025

rli



WP No. 31856 of 2019



M.DHANDAPANI J.

rli

WEB COPY

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

WP No. 31856 of 2019

08-09-2025