

*IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB
AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.*

CWP No. 1684 of 2016. [O&M]
Date of Decision: 25th January, 2016.

Rachana Singh
Versus

Petitioner through
Mr. Mathew J Nedumpara, Advocate.

Union of India & Ors.
Respondents through
Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for SBI.

***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU***

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?***
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?***
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?***

SURYA KANT, J. [ORAL]

The grievance of the petitioner in the instant writ petition is against the alleged non-observance of the principles of natural justice by the Deputy Commissioner, UT, Chandigarh who is seized of a matter under Section 14 of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Securities Interest Act, 2002. She has alleged that two immovable properties situated within Chandigarh are sought to be taken into possession by the State Bank of India through the process of Section 14 without hearing the petitioner who is an affected person.

The Bank is on caveat. Its learned counsel – Shri Rakesh Gupta, Advocate states that pursuant to some earlier order passed by this Court, the proceedings under Section 14 are being re-heard by the Deputy Commissioner, in which the husband of the petitioner has already put in appearance. The matter is now listed before the Deputy Commissioner on 28.01.2016. He fairly states that the

petitioner may also assist the Deputy Commissioner on the date fixed.

In this view of the matter, we dispose of this writ petition with liberty to the petitioner to put in appearance before the Deputy Commissioner, UT, Chandigarh on 28.01.2016 and the latter shall hear the petitioner as well before passing an appropriate order under Section 14 of the Act.

Disposed of. Dasti.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

January 25, 2016.
dinesh

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE