

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE NO.: W.A.No.513 of 2026

PROCEEDINGS SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
01.	05.05.2026	<u>MB,J & GPK,J</u> Mr. Avinash Desai, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Dishit Bhattacharjee, learned counsel appearing for the appellants. Ms. C. Rakee Sridharan, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.1/writ petitioner. Mr. A. Venkatsh, learned Senior Counsel representing Sri Manav Gecil Thomas, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent No.7. <u>I.A.No.1 of 2026</u> We have heard learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners/appellants (respondent Nos.7 to 9 in the Writ Petition), learned Senior Counsel appearing for the respondent No.7 (Canara Bank) and learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.1 (writ petitioner). The entire argument has been on the lack of any statutory basis for filing the Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India against the appellants. The submission is that the respondent No.7 (Canara Bank) holds only 29.99% of the shares in the appellant No.1 (Can Fin Homes Limited). Senior Counsel appearing for the appellants prays for the suspension of the impugned order dated 10.04.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.30421 of 2025 on the ground that the appellant No.1 is not amenable to the writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution. It is contended that the	

appellant No.1 is neither a 'State' nor fall within the ambit of Article 226 of the Constitution.

It is further argued that The Central Vigilance Commission Act, 2003 and The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 are not applicable to the facts of the present case since the respondent Nos.6 to 9 (as arrayed in the Writ Petition) do not fall within the definition of a 'public servant', as defined under section 2(c) of The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

List this matter on 06.05.2026 for orders.

MB,J

GPK,J

va