

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 24/08/2025

NAND RAO SOORVE And ANOTHER-s Vs State Bank of India

Court: NATIONAL CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION

Date of Decision: Aug. 10, 1994

Citation: 1995 2 CPC 288: 1995 2 CPJ 344

Hon'ble Judges: A. Venkatarami Reddy, J. Ananda Lakshmi J.

Advocate: Mohan Rao, K.V.Subrahmanya Narsu

Judgement

1. IT is an application filed by one Mr. Nand Rao and Navind School against the State Bank of India for a direction to the opposite party for

payment of damages of Rs. 4,05,300.00 mainly on the ground that the opposite party is not justified in rejecting the application of the complainant

for sanction of loan having processed it. IT is submitted that the said rejection was for extraneous considerations.

2. ON the other hand, the learned Counsel for the opposite party, Mr. K.V. Subramanya Narsu, submitted that after due consideration of various

reports with regard to the valuation and with regard to the availability of water and the financial capacity, the opposite party rejected the

application.

This Commission cannot sit over a judgment of the decision of the Bank, as its decision is based on the material before it.

During the course of arguments, the learned Counsel for the complainant submitted that without going into the merits of the case, his client, that is,

the complainant is prepared to approach the bank with a fresh request for sanction of loan, and the opposite party may be directed to consider the

said fresh application, according to the norms and guidelines relating to the sanction of such loan. Having regard to the aforesaid submission of the

learned Counsel, we dispose off the complaint without going into the merits with a direction it is open to the complainant to approach the opposite

party with a fresh request and if necessary, a fresh application for sanction of loan. On such application and request made, the opposite party is

directed to consider the application on merits in accordance with the guidelines. No costs. Complaint dismissed.