(1993) 04 NCDRC CK 0002

In the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission

Jagannath Meher APPELLANT

Vs

BRANCH MANAGER STATE BANK OF INDIA RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 15-04-1993

Acts Referred:

Citation : 1993 1 CLC 76 : 1993 1 CLT 553 : 1993 1 CTJ 670 : 1993 2 CPJ 147 : 1993 2 CPR 95

Hon'ble Judges : V.BALAKRISHNA ERADI , A.S.VIJAYAKAR , B.S.YADAV J.

Judgement

1. THE Complainant, aged 41 years, is a weaver, who was lured by the advertisement published by the State Bank of India seeking applications from candidates with proper aptitude and attitude to start an industry in Boudh Khandamal & Kalahandi Districts. In this scheme training and assistance was assured to selected candidates.

2. THE Complainant appeared for the test and was selected for training. He submitted a project proposal in 1983 to start a handloom manufacturing unit in Baunsuni. A loan was sanctioned, but according to him it was inadequate for proper establishment of the unit. He represented again in 1985 for increased loan facility and by the time this request came through, in 1988, the cost factor had again gone up. Even the increased loan was not released to him in time, and all these factors led to monetary losses, loss of production activity and loss of social prestige and prestige in the market too. He had to retrench the 25 people that he employed. His production stopped and he estimates his monetary loss to Rs. 3,83,157.66 paise in manufacturing activity and Rs. 40,000/ - towards the market credit till January, 1991. The Opposite Parties in their reply have maintained that the Complainant has not been showing interest in regularising the accounts. In a letter written to the Complainant dated the 2nd March, 1987, they have given the details of amounts sanction and present outstanding amounts. Amount sanctioned Present amount outstanding 1. Cash Credit A/c. Gen/SSI/CC -62 Rs. 94,000/ Rs. 1,22,820.75 2. Gen/SSI/TL -1 (Building Loan) Rs. 99,000/ - Rs. 1,04,177.40 3. Gen/SSI/TL -2 (Equipment Finance) Rs. 40,800/ - Rs. 47,772.55 This shows that substantial amounts have been

advanced to the Complainant but he has not been able to pay up the loans. No case has been established to show deficiency in service on the part of the Bank.

3. WITH regard to the allegations of the Complainant that adequate amounts as required were not advanced at the right time, we cannot sit in judgment upon the decision taken by the Bank as this is a power of discretion of the Bank and we have no reason to think that the Bank acted otherwise than in good faith. Thus we hold that the Complainant has not made out any case for the grant of relief.

4. IN the light of the foregoing discussions, the original petition fails and we dismiss it with no order as to costs. O.P. dismissed.

