

\$~57

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 6100/2016**

ADITA TYAGI

..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr.Sumit Sarna, Advocate**

versus

M/S ICICI BANK LIMITED

..... Respondent

Represented by: **None**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP NANDRAJOG

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

18.07.2016

CM No.24999/2016

Allowed.

W.P.(C) 6100/2016

1. Impugned order dated June 30, 2016 has simply issued notice to the petitioner. The petitioner has been required to submit an affidavit disclosing petitioner's assets.
2. There is an order in favour of the bank pertaining to the credit availed of. The original application filed by the bank has been allowed.
3. We see no reason to interfere with the impugned order dated June 30, 2016. The assertion in the writ petition that under the impugned order the petitioner is facing threat of being arrested is wrong. The impugned order simply requires the petitioner to file an affidavit disclosing the assets.
4. Grievance in the writ petition concerning repossession of the financed

vehicle, its sale and amount realized would relate to adjustments of the credit availed of and needless to state said issue has to be agitated before the Recovery Officer or perhaps the Debt Recovery Tribunal.

5. We dismiss the writ petition without any order as to costs.

PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JULY 18, 2016

pg'