

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

239

**CWP No. 12693 of 2016
Date of decision: 16.08.2016**

Ravinder Jain and Others

..petitioners

Vs.

State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur and Others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN**

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate for the petitioners.

**Mr. Sumit Batra, Advocate
for respondents No. 1 and 2.**

**Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for respondents No. 3 and 4.**

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.(ORAL)

Petitioners have approached this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for quashing the public notices dated 16.06.2016 (Annexure P-6) and dated 17.06.2016 (Annexure P-7).

2. In pursuance of notice of motion having been issued reply on behalf of respondents No. 1 and 2 has been filed in Court today and the same is taken on record. Reply on behalf of respondents No. 3 and 4 has already been filed.

3. A perusal of the impugned notices shows that respondents No. 1 and 2 had given only 15 days time to the petitioners to deposit the outstanding amount from the date of the publication of the notices. It was further mentioned that otherwise the bank shall take legal action against them.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners are prepared to regulate their account with respondents No. 1 and 2. It was not

disputed that so far as respondents No. 3 and 4 are concerned, the petitioner had no grievance subsisting against them.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, perusing the record and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy involved herein we dispose of the present writ petition by permitting the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation before respondent No. 1 by raising the pleas as have been sought to be raised in the present petition within 15 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It is further observed that in the event of filing any such representation by the petitioners within the stipulated period the same should be decided by respondent No. 1 within next one month by passing a speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing, in accordance with law. Needless to say that anything observed herein as well mentioned in the reply of respondents No. 1 and 2 shall not come in the way of the petitioners while deciding the said representation.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

August 16, 2016
Poonam (II)

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No