

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 2131 of 2014

Punjab National Bank Special Assets Management Department Circle Office, Madina
Manzil, Kutchery Chowk, Raipur CG Through Its Authorised Officer (Original
Respondent No.1 In DRT)

---- Petitioner

Versus

- 1. M/s Shiv Shankar Solvent Extraction Pvt.Ltd. Regd Office At Lal Bagicha
Main Road Dhamtari Cg Through Its Director Shri Sudhir Singhal
- 2. Sudhir Singhal S/o Lt. Ratan Lal Ji Singhal Aged About 48 Years R/o Lal
Bagicha Main Road Dhamtari CG [original applicants in DRT]
- 3. Shri Keshavram Jain And Sons Aged About 45 Years Through Its Proprietor
Anil Kumar Jain S/o Keshavram Jain R/o Infront Of Jhankar Talkies Jaipur
Road Jagdalpur Dist. Bastar CG [original respondent No.2 in DRT]

---- Respondents

And

WPC No. 2571 Of 2014

Punjab National Bank Special Assets Management Department Circle Office Madina
Manzil Kuthery Chowk Raipur Chhattisgarh Through Its Authorised Officer

---- Petitioner

Vs

- 1. Shri Keshavran Jain & Sons Through Its Proprietor Anil Kumar Jain S/o Shri
Keshavram Jain R/o In Front Of Jhankar Talkies Jaipur Road Jagdalpur
District Bastar C.G.
- 2. M/s Shiv Shankar Solvent Extraction Pvt. Ltd. A Company Incorporated
Under The Relevant Provisions Of The Companies Act 1956 Registered
Office at: Lal Bagicha Main Road Dhamtari C.G. Through Its Director Shri
Sudhir Singhal

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Sachin Singh Rajput, Advocate
For Respondent No. 2	:	Shri Ankit Singhal, Advocate

Order On Board

17/07/2015

The aforesaid petitions were filed by the petitioner as the Debt Recovery Appellate Tribunal at Allahabad was not functional.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that now, Tribunal has become functional and therefore, he may be permitted to withdraw this petition with liberty to pursue pending appeal and stay application.
3. This is not opposed by the counsel for respondents.
4. Accordingly, the petitions are disposed off with the liberty as prayed for.
5. Considering that the petitioner was enjoying a protective umbrella under an order of this Court, it would be in the interest of justice to give limited protection to the petitioner to the effect that the impugned order shall not be given effect to for a period of one month from today.

Sd/-

Manindra Mohan Shrivastava
Judge