
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

211

**Civil Writ Petition No.3096 of 2016
Date of Decision: December 15, 2016**

Bant Singh

....Petitioner

versus

Bank of India and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Harsh Goyal, Advocate for
Mr. Tribhawan Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, for quashing the order dated 07.01.2016 (**Annexure P-4**) passed by the District Magistrate, Ludhiana for taking the actual physical possession of the land measuring 16 kanals 18 marlas (out of total about 240 kanals) without getting it partitioned at the instance of respondents No.1 and 2. Further prayer has also been made to restrict the respondents to take the actual physical possession of the land without getting it partitioned.

2. It was not disputed that the order impugned herein is appealable under Section 17 of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security

Interest Act, 2002 (for short 'the Act').

3. Section 17 of the Act reads thus:-

“17. Right to appeal

(1) Any person (including borrower), aggrieved by any of the measures referred to in sub-section (4) of section 13 taken by the secured creditor or his authorised officer under this Chapter, may make an application alongwith such fee, as may be prescribed to the Debts Recovery Tribunal having jurisdiction in the matter within forty-five days from the date on which such measure had been taken:

PROVIDED that different fees may be prescribed for making the application by the borrower and the person other than the borrower.

Explanation : For the removal of doubts, it is hereby declared that the communication of the reasons to the borrower by the secured creditor for not having accepted his representation or objection or the likely action of the secured creditor at the stage of communication of reasons to the borrower shall not entitle the person (including borrower) to make an application to the Debts Recovery Tribunal under this subsection.

(2) The Debts Recovery Tribunal shall consider whether any of the measures referred to in sub-section (4) of section 13 taken by the secured creditor for enforcement of security are in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the rules made thereunder.

(3) If, the Debts Recovery Tribunal, after examining the facts and circumstances of the case and evidence produced by the parties, comes to the conclusion that any of the measures referred to in sub-section (4) of section 13, taken by the secured creditor are not in

accordance with the provisions of this Act and the rules made thereunder, and require restoration of the management of the business to the borrower or restoration of possession of the secured assets to the borrower, it may by order, declare the recourse to any one or more measures referred to in sub-section (4) of section 13 taken by the secured creditors as invalid and restore the possession of the secured assets to the borrower or restore the management of the business to the borrower, as the case may be, and pass such order as it may consider appropriate and necessary in relation to any of the recourse taken by the secured creditor under sub-section (4) of section 13.

(4) If, the Debts Recovery Tribunal declares the recourse taken by a secured creditor under sub-section (4) of section 13, is in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the rules made thereunder, then, notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, the secured creditor shall be entitled to take recourse to one or more of the measures specified under sub-section (4) of section 13 to recover his secured debt.

(5) Any application made under sub-section (1) shall be dealt with by the Debts Recovery Tribunal as expeditiously as possible and disposed of within sixty days from the date of such application:

PROVIDED that the Debts Recovery Tribunal may, from time to time, extend the said period for reasons to be recorded in writing, so, however, that the total period of pendency of the application with the Debts Recovery Tribunal, shall not exceed four months from the date of making of such application made under sub-section (1).

(6) If the application is not disposed of by the Debts Recovery Tribunal within the period of four months as

specified in sub-section (5), any part to the application may make an application, in such form as may be prescribed, to the Appellate Tribunal for directing the Debts Recovery Tribunal for expeditious disposal of the application pending before the Debts Recovery Tribunal and the Appellate Tribunal may, on such application, make an order for expeditious disposal of the pending application by the Debts Recovery Tribunal.

(7) Save as otherwise provided in this Act, the Debts Recovery Tribunal shall, as far as may be, dispose of the application in accordance with the provisions of the Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 and the rules made thereunder.”

5. Since certain disputed questions of fact are involved in this case, in such a situation, we refrain ourselves to entertain the present writ petition and relegate the petitioner to avail the aforesaid alternative remedy, in accordance with law.

6. Dismissed.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

December 15, 2016

sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No