



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

WP No. 40409 of 2025

N.Mohamed Moosa

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. M/s.Yes Bank

Rep By tts Branch Manager

No.143/1, Uthamar Gandhi Salai

Nungambakkam,(opp.Hotel Park),

Chennai-34.

2.Shahid Mohammed

Sole Arbitrator

C/o. M/s.Yes Bank

No.143/1, Uthamar Gandhi Salai

Nungambakkam, (opp Hotel Park),

Chennai-600 034.

3.State Bank Of India

Rep. By Its Branch Manager

Rajaji Salai Branch,

Anchor Gate Building,

Rajaji Salai, Chennai- 600 001.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: The writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of Constitution of



India, to issue a writ of mandamus directing the 3rd respondent namely state Bank of India, Rajaji salai Branch, Chennai- 600 001, to defreeze the petitioners savings Bank account bearing number 10886011179.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Sathish Rajan

For Respondent: Mr.R.Sreedhar R1

ORDER

The writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to the 3rd respondent namely state Bank of India, Rajaji salai Branch, Chennai- 600 001, to defreeze the petitioners savings Bank account bearing number 10886011179.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner availed loan for a sum of Rs.9,00,000/- from the first respondent bank under a loan agreement in the year 2022. The first respondent seems to have invoked the arbitration clause and appointed the second respondent as an Arbitrator unilaterally without the knowledge and consent of the petitioner. The second respondent who was appointed by the first respondent without serving the notice to the petitioner, passed an ex-parte order under Section 17 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act. The 3rd respondent based on the interim order passed by the second respondent, frozen the petitioner's bank account and not permitting the petitioner to operate the account, for which, the petitioner has made representation on 03.01.2024 to the third respondent to defreeze the account and the said request was rejected by them. Hence, the petitioner filed the present writ petition.



3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that this Court may permit the petitioner to challenge the interim award passed by the second respondent. The interim award passed by the Arbitrator did not reveal with regard to the claim made by the first respondent and the place of Arbitration. Therefore, this Court may direct the first respondent to communicate the interim award and all the details to the petitioner.

4. Heard the learned counsel for both side and perused the materials available on record.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the limited request sought for by the petitioner, this court directs the first respondent to furnish all the details to the petitioner with regard to the interim award passed by the second respondent within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. With the above directions, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

28-10-2025

rlh

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WP No. 40409 of 2025



M.DHANDAPANI J.
rli

To
WEB COPY

1.M/s.Yes Bank

Rep By Its Branch Manager
No.143/1, Uthamar Gandhi Salai
Nungambakkam,(opp.Hotel Park),
Chennai-34.

2.Shahid Mohammed

Sole Arbitrator C/o. M/s.Yes Bank
No.143/1, Uthamar Gandhi Salai
Nungambakkam, (opp Hotel Park),
Chennai-600 034.

3.State Bank Of India

Rep. By Its Branch Manager
Rajaji Salai Branch,
Anchor Gate Building,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai- 600 001.

W.P.No.40409 of 2025

28.10.2025



WEB COPY

WP No. 40409 of 2025

