



2026:CGHC:4069



2026:CGHC:4069

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 300 of 2026

1 - Jmk Agro Products A Partnership Firm Having Its Registered Office At Shop No. 310, 311, 312 S.S. Plaza, Power House Road, Korba Through Its Partner Manisha Singhal, Aged About 33 Years, W/o Shri Sachin Kumar Singhal, R/o Flat No. A-2, Sai Enclave, Agroha Marg Korba (C.G.)

... **Petitioner****versus**

1 - Bank Of Maharashtra Through Its Managing Director, Head Office At 1501, Lokmangal, Shivajinagar, Pune, (Maharashtra)
2 - General Manager Bank Of Maharashtra, At 1501, Lokmangal, Shivajinagar, Pune, (Maharashtra)
3 - Venkatesh V. Zonal Manager, Bank Of Maharashtra, Raipur (C.G.)
4 - Branch Manager Bank Of Maharashtra, Branch- T.P. Nagar, Korba, District Korba (C.G.)

... **Respondents**

(Cause title, as taken from CIS)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Harsh Wardhan Agrawal, Advocate
For Respondents	:	Mr. Anumeh Shrivastava, Advocate

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

23/01/2026

1. Heard.



2. This petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India has been preferred by petitioner seeking following reliefs:-

“10.1 That, the Hon’ble Court may kindly pleased to call for the entire records in respect of the grievance of the petitioner from the respondents.

10.2 That, this Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent Bank to urgently sanction the proposal of the petitioner for enhanced B.G. limit within a specific time period.

10.3 That, this Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent No.1 to initiate enquiry and take strict action against the respondent No.3 on the complaint filed by the petitioner.

10.4 That, the Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief which the Hon’ble Court deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

10.5 That, the Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant cost of the petition to the petitioner.”

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is a registered Partnership Firm duly registered under the Indian Partnership Act, 1932. The petitioner had filed application for enhancement of Bank Guarantee Limit from Rs.5 crores to Rs.8 crores but the same has not been decided yet. He would further submit that he has also made application (Annexure P-6) dated 12.01.2026 to the Chief General Manager, Customer Grievance Redressal Cell, Bank of Maharashtra, despite that, the same has not been decided till date. He



next submitted that the petitioner may be permitted to withdraw this petition with liberty to file appropriate application before the respondent authorities/competent authority and the same may be directed to dispose of within a stipulated period.

4. On this, learned counsel for the respondents submits that application filed by petitioner for enhancement of Bank Guarantee Limit has been rejected by respondent No.4 vide order dated 22.01.2026. In this regard, the communication has also been sent to the petitioner. He further submits that if the petitioner files a representation/application before the respondents/ competent authority, then it shall be considered and decided in accordance with law.
5. Having considered the limited prayer of the petitioner, this petition is disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to raise its grievance before the respondent No.2, within a period of 30 days from today along with a copy of this order. Thereafter, respondent No.2 is directed to decide the same expeditiously.
6. It is made clear that this Court has not made any observation into the merits of the case, therefore, the application filed by petitioner may be decided strictly in accordance with applicable law/rules/guidelines.
7. Accordingly, this writ petition stands **disposed of**.
8. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, stands disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
JUDGE