The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026
Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution- Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

CASE COMMENTARY

JOSEPH KURUVILLA VELLUKUNNEL V. RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

Sujitha Partheeban

I. CITATION:

Case Name	Joseph Kuruvilla Vellukunnel v. Reserve Bank of India
Citation	AIR 1962 SC 1371
Court	Supreme Court of India
Date of Judgment	March 7, 1962
Case No.	Civil Appeal No. 487 of 1961 (with connected Writ Petition No. 167 of 1961)
Appeal From	Order of the Kerala High Court directing the winding up of the Palai Central Bank Ltd.

II. BENCH:

The matter was heard by a five-judge Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court, comprising:

1. Bhuvneshwar P. Sinha, C.J.

2. M. Hidayatullah, J. (delivered the majority judgment)

3. J.L. Kapur, J. (delivered the dissenting opinion)

4. J.C. Shah, J. (concurred in the dissent)

5. J.R. Mudholkar, J.

Hidayatullah, J., delivered the majority judgment on behalf of himself, Sinha, C.J., and Mudholkar, J. Kapur, J., delivered a dissenting opinion on behalf of himself and Shah, J.

III. FACTS:

The Palai Central Bank Ltd., one of the largest banks in Kerala with roughly ten crore rupees in deposits and twenty-five branches, had been under periodic Reserve Bank inspection since the 1950s. Successive inspections revealed unsound advances, large unsecured loans to directors and their associates, and dividends declared without adequate provision for bad debts. The Reserve Bank repeatedly warned the Bank and issued corrective directions, but the irregularities persisted. In June 1960, a run began on the Bank's branches; between late June and early August 1960 deposits fell by over eighty lakh rupees. Concluding that the Bank could not meet its obligations to depositors and that its continuance was prejudicial to their interests, the Reserve Bank applied to the Kerala High Court on August 8, 1960 under Section 38 of the Banking Companies Act, 1949 for an order winding up the Bank. The High Court heard the Reserve Bank, the Bank, and various creditors, and on December 5, 1960 ordered the winding up. The appellant, a former director and contributory of the Bank, appealed by special leave, principally challenging the constitutionality of the winding-up provision itself rather than the correctness of the Reserve Bank's assessment.

IV. ISSUES:

(1) Whether Section 38(1) and Section 38(3)(b)(iii) of the Banking Companies Act, 1949, which made it mandatory for the High Court to order the winding up of a banking company once the Reserve Bank applied for it, violated Article 14 of the Constitution by discriminating between banking and non-banking companies.

(2) Whether the same provisions imposed an unreasonable restriction on the right to carry on business under Article 19(1)(f) and (g), by excluding judicial inquiry into the correctness of the Reserve Bank's opinion and thereby denying the banking company a hearing before the winding-up order.

(3) Whether the provisions were ultra vires as being in conflict with the freedom of trade, commerce, and intercourse guaranteed by Article 301.

V. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES:

For the appellant, it was contended that Section 38 made the Reserve Bank the sole judge of whether a banking company's affairs were prejudicial to depositors' interests, and that the High Court had no discretion but to order winding up once an application was made, in contrast to Section 433 of the Companies Act, 1956[1], under which an ordinary company could contest a winding-up petition on the merits and appeal an adverse order. This, it was argued, amounted to an unreasonable and discriminatory classification under Article 14[2], converted a judicial process into an executive act, and denied natural justice by excluding any judicial determination of the underlying facts. Reliance was placed on this Court's earlier decisions in *A.K. Gopalan*[3], *State of Madras v. V.G. Row*[4], and the *Shirur Mutt*[5] and *Jagannath Ramanuj Das*[6] cases, for the proposition that a law excluding judicial scrutiny before depriving a person of property or the right to carry on business is inherently unreasonable.

For the Reserve Bank, the Attorney-General argued that the Bank had in fact been given extensive opportunity over nearly a decade to remedy the defects found on inspection, that the application was precipitated by a genuine run on deposits requiring urgent action, and that banking companies were properly treated as a distinct class because they deal with public deposits rather than the stockholders' own capital, so that their insolvency carries direct public consequences absent in the case of ordinary companies. It was further argued, drawing on *Virendra v. State of Punjab*[7], that the legislature may reasonably entrust urgent, fact-intensive determinations to an expert body better placed than courts to assess them, without thereby rendering the law unconstitutional.

VI. RATIO DECIDENDI:

The majority (Hidayatullah, J.) held that banking companies and ordinary companies are not similarly situated: ordinary companies deal with shareholders' capital, whereas banking companies hold and deal with depositors' money, and their failure has consequences for the wider public and the financial system that the failure of an ordinary company does not. Given

[1]The Companies Act, 1956, § 433 (India).
[2]India Const. art. 14.
[3]A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras, AIR 1950 SC 27 (India).
[4]State of Madras v. V.G. Row, AIR 1952 SC 196 (India).
[5]Commissioner, Hindu Religious Endowments, Madras v. Sri Lakshmindra Thirtha Swamiar of Sri Shirur Mutt, AIR 1954 SC 282 (India).
[6]Mahant Sri Jagannath Ramanuj Das v. State of Orissa, AIR 1954 SC 400 (India).
[7]Virendra v. State of Punjab, AIR 1957 SC 896 (India).

the Reserve Bank's statutory role and institutional position as *a Banker's Bank*[8] with continuous supervisory access to every bank's affairs[9], the classification of banking companies for distinct, expedited winding-up treatment was held to rest on an intelligible differentia rationally connected to the object of protecting depositors, satisfying the established test under Article 14. On the natural-justice objection, the majority held that the judicial process was not excluded altogether: it operated fully once the winding-up petition reached the High Court, and was excluded only as to the anterior question of whether winding up should be ordered at all, a question the legislature could validly commit to an expert body better equipped than a court to assess a bank's solvency swiftly. The majority distinguished the precedents cited by the appellant on the ground that those cases concerned punitive or quasi-punitive executive action against an individual, whereas Section 38 authorised protective, non-punitive action to preserve depositors' funds in an emergency where delay itself could work irreversible harm.

The dissent (Kapur, J., for himself and Shah, J.) took the opposing view that a law which rests entirely on the subjective satisfaction of an outside authority, and which permanently deprives a citizen of property or the right to carry on business without any occasion for the High Court to examine whether the grounds in fact existed, is inherently unreasonable, however expert or well-intentioned the authority. The dissent would have struck down Section 38(3)(b)(iii) as an unreasonable restriction under Article 19(1)(f) and (g).

VII. JUDGMENT / HELD:

By a majority of three to two, the Supreme Court dismissed the appeal and the connected writ petition, holding that Sections 38(1) and 38(3)(b)(iii) of the Banking Companies Act, 1949 did not violate Article 14 or Article 19(1)(f) and (g) of the Constitution, and were, being manifestly in the public interest, protected against the Article 301 challenge by Article 302. Kapur and Shah, JJ., dissented, holding the provision unconstitutional under Article 19.

VIII. CRITICAL ANALYSIS:

The majority's reasoning sits within the orthodox 'reasonable classification' framework developed under Article 14, and its outcome is defensible on the facts: the Palai Bank had received nine years of warnings and remedial opportunity before the Reserve Bank finally moved, which blunts the force of any natural-justice complaint on the specific record. The harder question, which the dissent presses more squarely, is whether reasonableness on a

[8]All India Bank Employees' Ass'n v. National Industrial Tribunal, AIR 1962 SC 171 (India).
[9]The Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, §§ 7-8 (India).

particular set of facts should be allowed to validate a structural feature of the statute itself — namely, that the High Court's role is reduced to formal execution of the Reserve Bank's opinion, with no provision at all for a bank to contest the factual basis of that opinion before the court, in any case, however the facts may fall. The majority's answer, that courts too would in practice defer to Reserve Bank's expertise in a genuine emergency, is a prediction about likely outcomes rather than an answer to the objection that the statute affords no legal opportunity for a different outcome even in the exceptional case where the Reserve Bank errs. The dissent's insistence on some minimal judicial check therefore has continuing force, particularly given the scale of consequence — the permanent extinguishment of a banking company along with the property and business rights of its directors and shareholders.

The decision also reflects a broader and still-recurring theme in Indian administrative law: courts' willingness to leave time-sensitive, technically complex determinations to an expert regulator, calibrated to the degree of urgency and the regulator's comparative institutional advantage, as seen later in the Court's treatment of Reserve Bank action in cases such as the Thiruvalla East Co-operative Bank dispute, where courts continued to scrutinise whether the regulator's order itself reflected application of mind even while accepting the underlying scheme of regulatory deference.

It should also be noted that the appellant's American and Japanese comparative law arguments were rightly given limited weight; both jurisdictions permit executive closure of insolvent banks without full judicial trial, but drawing on foreign banking regimes designed against different constitutional guarantees offers only modest guidance for the specific content of Articles 14 and 19[10]. Subsequent constitutional commentary has generally read the case as an early instance of the Court's willingness to sustain 'subjective satisfaction' clauses where the underlying subject-matter — here, banking regulation in the public interest — supplies a sufficient institutional justification, in contrast to cases such as *Thakur Raghubir Singh*[11], where no comparable justification was found[12].

IX. CONCLUSION:

Vellukunnel remains a foundational precedent on the constitutional validity of India's bank winding-up regime and on the wider question of when a legislature may commit an economically consequential, fact-intensive decision to expert regulatory opinion rather than

[10]M.P. Jain, Indian Constitutional Law 895-98 (8th ed. 2018).

[11]Thakur Raghubir Singh v. Court of Wards, Ajmer, AIR 1953 SC 373 (India).

[12]H.M. Seervai, Constitutional Law of India: A Critical Commentary 437-40 (4th ed. 1991).

prior judicial trial. Its enduring significance lies less in any novel doctrinal test than in its articulation of banking as a business affected with a public interest, justifying differentiated regulatory treatment — a characterisation of banking regulation that continues to inform the Reserve Bank's supervisory and winding-up powers today[13], and one that sits within the broader constitutional settlement by which India's founders entrusted key economic institutions to specialised, insulated regulators[14].

[13]Reserve Bank of India v. Thiruvalla East Co-operative Bank Ltd., Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 15667/2023 (India).

[14]Granville Austin, Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience 108-12 (1999).