



2026:UHC:4802

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<p><u>WPMS/1712/2026</u> <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.</u></p> <p>Mr. Dushyant Mainali, Advocate for the petitioners. Mr. Ashish Joshi, Advocate assisted by Mr. Shobhit Joshi, Advocate for the Bank.</p> <p>2. By means of this writ petition, petitioners have sought the following reliefs:</p> <p>“i. Issue a writ of certiorari quashing the notice dated 24.03.2026 (Annexure No. 1) (Page No.19 to 20) issued by the respondent no. 2 to the petitioner no. 1 firm of the petitioner no. 2, whereby the loan account of the petitioner no. 1 has been classified as 'fraud' by the bank and has been reported to the Reserve Bank of India to get it reflected in the Central Fraud Registry.</p> <p>ii. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding and directing the respondent authorities to refrain from taking any coercive action against the petitioner's firm in furtherance of the impugned notice dated 24.03.2026 issued by the respondent no. 2 to the petitioner no. 1 firm of the petitioner no. 2.</p> <p>3. Petitioner No. 2 claims to be partner of petitioner No. 1 firm. A working capital loan of Rs. 5.75 crore was taken by the said firm from Almora Urban Cooperative Bank Limited which was later taken over by Canara Bank on petitioner's request. Canara Bank has classified the loan account as 'fraud' on the complaint of the</p>



Guarantor/Mortgager.

4. According to the petitioner, he was not heard before classifying the loan account as fraud. Learned counsel appearing for the Bank, however, submits that show cause notice was issued to petitioner No. 1 as well as petitioner No. 2 on 19.09.2025; however, reply to the show cause notice was not given by any of the petitioners.

5. He further points out that a notice for personal hearing was given to both the petitioners on 30.10.2025, calling upon the petitioner to submit reply within 7 days; however, petitioner again did not respond to the show cause notice.

6. He submits that since petitioner did not come forward by submitting reply to the notice/opportunity given to him from time to time, therefore loan account was classified as fraud and Reserve Bank of India was informed accordingly.

7. This Court is not inclined to entertain this writ petition.

8. Whether any fraud has been committed by petitioners or not can be examined by the Reserve Bank of India. In the absence of expertise in the matter, this Court do not find



2026:UHC:4802

any reason to interfere.

9. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

10. However, petitioner shall be at liberty to raise all submissions before the Reserve Bank of India.

(Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.)

15.06.2026

Mahinder/