



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-03-2026

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 27572 of 2022

Shri Raveendra Nath,
S/o. Ravi Namboodhripad,
Suite No. 261, 2nd Floor Kaveri Complex,
96-104, Nungambakkam High Road,
Nungambakkam, Chennai 600 034.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.The Chief Manager,
Indian Bank, Thousand Lights Branch,
Kannamani Building,
No. 611, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 006.

2.M/s.Indian Bank,
Corporate Office: PB No: 5555,
254-206, Avvai Shanmugam Salai,
Royapettah, Chennai – 600 014.

3.S.Sivakumar,
Indian Bank Employee,
Thousand Lights Branch,
Kannamani Building,
No.611, Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 006.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER:-Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for an issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 and 2, bank to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 23.08.2021, in so far as, in the said representation the petitioner had sought for to initiate appropriate action as against the 3rd respondent.



WEB COPY

WP No. 27572 of 2022




For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Baskaran
For Respondent(s): Ms.Rita Chandrasekar
For M/s.Aiyar & Dolia
For R1 & R2

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking to direct the respondents 1 and 2, the Bank to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 23.08.2021, in so far as, in the said representation, the petitioner had sought to initiate appropriate action as against the 3rd respondent.

2.Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the 3rd respondent, who is working under the 1st respondent insisted the petitioner to invest in the scheme named “Pozhi Scheme”, which according to the 3rd respondent, was floated by one of his friend. The petitioner invested a sum of Rs.3,60,000/- in the year 2023 in the said scheme. However, the amount was not returned by the 3rd respondent till date. Hence, the petitioner made a representation dated 23.08.2021 to the respondents 1 and 2 requesting to conduct enquiry in this regard and take action against the 3rd respondent. Since the said representation was not considered by the respondents 1 and 2, the present writ petition has been filed.

3.Learned counsel appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 would submit that the issue in the present case is the private dispute between the petitioner and



the 3rd respondent. Further, the 3rd respondent has retired from his service and the Bank has no control over the 3rd respondent at this time. Thus, the respondents 1 and 2 has no role in the present issue.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned counsel appearing for the respondents 1 and 2.

5. Considering the submissions made by either parties, this Court is of the view that as rightly contended by the learned counsel appearing for the respondents 1 and 2, though the 3rd respondent was working with the 1st respondent, at present he is retired from his service and the respondents 1 and 2 has no control over the 3rd respondent now. Furthermore, since the issue in the present case is a private affairs between the petitioner and the 3rd respondent, no mandamus can be issued against the respondents 1 and 2 as requested by the petitioner in his representation.

6. In view of the above, this writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

17-03-2026

rst

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WEB COPY

To

1.The Chief Manager,
Indian Bank Thousand Lights Branch,
Kannamani Building,
No. 611, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 006.

2.M/s.Indian Bank,
Corporate Office: PB No: 5555,
254-206, Avvai Shanmugam Salai,
Royapettah, Chennai – 600 014.



WEB COPY

WP No. 27572 of 2022



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

rst

WP No. 27572 of 2022

17-03-2026