

2

\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 3991/2013**

MOHD. YUSUF CHAUDHARY Petitioner
Through: **Mr.S.D.Ansari and Mr.I Ahmed,**
Advocates.

versus

PUNJAB AND SIND BANK AND ORS. Respondents
Through: **Mr.Pratap Singh, Advocate for R-1**

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.K. BHASIN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA


ORDER
% **21.06.2013**

Today learned counsel for respondent No.1/Bank, which appears to be the only contesting party in the present writ petition, has submitted that even though the DRT itself has in the impugned order said that the sale of the property in question would be subject to the final decision on the petitioner's objection against the auction, being S.A. No.192 of 2013, today also, it can be recorded by this Court that if auction is held on the scheduled date, i.e., 28.6.2013, the bank shall not ask for confirmation of the sale by the DRT till the said S.A. No.192 of 2013 is disposed of. It is also stated that amended public notice of auction, mentioning therein specifically that the auction of the property in question would be subject to the final decision in S.A No.192 of 2013 filed by the present petitioner and further that the confirmation of sale shall also be applied for by the bank depending upon the outcome of the


said S.A. No.192 of 2013, shall be issued before 24.6.2013 on which date the prospective buyers are to inspect the property going to be auctioned.

In view of the aforesaid statement made by the learned counsel for respondent No.1/Bank in this petition, which was filed because the DRAT is closed for vacations is disposed of accordingly and consequently the petitioner's appeal filed before the DRAT becomes infructuous.

Dasti.



P.K. BHASIN, J
(VACATION JUDGE)



SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 21, 2013/SV