HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:60473
WP No. 22184 of 2024

CNR: KAHC010466922024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V SRISHANANDA

WRIT PETITION NO. 22184 OF 2024 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

MANAPPURAM FINANCE LIMITED
MANNAPURAM HOUSE, VALAPAD,
THRISSUR DISTRICT
KERALA STATE 680 567

HAVING ITS BRANCH OFFICE
AT 948, J K COMPLEX, IST FLOOR, 16TH BLOCK,
YELAHANKA NEW TOWN,
BANGALORE 560 064
REGISTERED UNDER COMPANIES ACT
REPRESENTED BY ITS ASSISTANT MANAGER AND
AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE
SRI. CHIDANANDA S G

...PETITIONER

Digitally signed by SUMA B N
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

(BY SRI. AMIT ANAND DESHPANDE, ADVOCATE (VC) FOR
SRI. SURESH V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

MRS. BINCY G
W/O MR. GISHORE V G
AGED MAJOR,
VYLOKUZHY HOUSE,
MUPPATHADAM
ERNAKULAM 683 110

...RESPONDENT

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO CALL FOR ENTIRE RECORDS IN C.C.NO. 612/2021 ON THE FILE OF THE COURT OF XI ADDITIONAL SCJ AND ACMM, (SCCH-12) IS ANNEXURE -A AT BENGALURU. TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER OF CLOSURE DTD. 11.02.2023 IN C.C.NO. 612/2021 ON THE FILE OF THE XI ADDITIONAL SCJ AND ACMM, (SCCH -12) IS ANNEXURE-A AT BENGALURU AND ALLOW THIS WRIT PETITION AND PERMIT THE PETITIONER TO TAKE NECESSARY STEPS AGAINST THE RESPONDENT.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V SRISHANANDA

ORAL ORDER

1. Heard Sri. Amit Anand Deshpande, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Sri. V. Suresh, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Petitioner was the complainant before the trial Court, based on the memo filed by the learned counsel for the petitioner-Company, matter was referred to the Lok Adalat and complaint came to be withdrawn.

3. Later on, it is realized that while mentioning the case number to be withdrawn, on account of the mistake occurred in the office of the learned counsel who represented the

petitioner, the complaint in C.C.No.612/2021, came to be withdrawn and therefore the same needs to be restored.

4. Counsel who represented the petitioner-company has filed the present petition and the Office of the petitioner-company has filed an affidavit in that regard.

5. Summons in the original criminal case was not served on the accused.

6. It is at that stage the complaint came to be withdrawn.

7. Sri. Amit Anand Deshpande, learned counsel for the petitioner-Company would submit that for the mistake of the counsel the rights of the petitioner-company shall not be jeopardized and therefore sought for allowing the petition as there is no provision to restore the complaint, which came to be withdrawn by mistake insofar as the trial Magistrate is concerned.

8. Taking note of the facts and circumstances of the case, imposing cost of Rs.10,000/- payable by the petitioner-company to the Advocates' Welfare Fund, Bengaluru, the order

of withdrawal, based on the memo filed by the Counsel for Petitioner is hereby set aside and on production of the proof of payment of cost, the petition stands restored before the Trial Magistrate.

9. Time is granted to pay the cost till 25.11.2026.

10. With the above observation, petition is ***disposed of***.

SD/-
(V SRISHANANDA)
JUDGE

RL
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 33