



**IN THE JUDICATURE OF HIGH COURT AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

907 WRIT PETITION NO. 1937 OF 2026

Taj Ayesha Kagzi Riyaz Ahmed

VERSUS

Axis Bank Through Its Branch Manager And Others

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Tupe Rajendra Gorakhanath

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

Dated : March 06, 2026

PER COURT :

1. Heard.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that an Arbitrator has been appointed without issuing notice to the petitioner. He further submits that even if it is held that notice is served on the petitioner, an Arbitrator cannot be appointed by the respondent unilaterally without following the due process prescribed under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act. He submits that the interim order passed by the learned Arbitrator, placing a lien on the petitioner's State Bank of India salary account, is *prima facie* illegal, as the learned Arbitrator has no jurisdiction to enter into the arbitration proceedings.

3. Considering the submissions of the learned Counsel for the petitioner, issue notice to the respondents, indicating that the matter may be disposed of at the stage of admission, returnable on 24/03/2026. *Humdast* permitted. In addition thereto, the petitioner is permitted to serve the respondents by all private permissible modes.

4. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's salary of about Rs.59,000/- is credited to his account with the State Bank of India and that he has not been able to withdraw any amount from the said account for the last four months.
5. Until further orders, by way of ad-interim relief, it is directed that the State Bank of India shall not prevent the petitioner from withdrawing an amount of Rs. 35,000/- per month from his account.
6. List the matter immediately after fresh admission matters.

(ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.)

vj gawade/-.