

Mr. Bharat Jayantilal Thakkar	}	Petitioner
versus		
Union Bank of India and Ors.	}	Respondents

**CORAM :- S. C. DHARMADHIKARI &
B. P. COLABAWALLA, JJ.**

P.C. :-

1. It is stated on behalf of the petitioner that there were settlement proposals and exchanged between the borrower and the first respondent bank. The petitioner's advocate wants to confirm the oral instructions from the petitioner. However, in para 19 of the petition, it is stated that the petitioner has filed an application under section 17 of the SARFAESI Act before the DRT. Even if the petitioner claims to be an innocent third party and not concerned with any of the dealings and transactions between the borrower and the bank, we think that the remedy that the petitioner has availed of is equally efficacious. He can seek all reliefs and as are permissible in law. In the circumstances, the writ petition need not be kept pending. It is disposed of. Ad-interim/interim relief, if any, stands vacated forthwith.

(B.P.COLABAWALLA, J.) (S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)