

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

203

**Civil Writ Petition No.12572 of 2016
Date of Decision: March 21, 2017**

Jagjit Singh

....Petitioner

versus

Central Bank of India

....Respondent

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

Present: Ms. Seerat Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Aalok Jagga, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Mankotia, Advocate for
Mr. I.P. Singh, Advocate
for the respondent.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The challenge in this petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is to notice dated 01.06.2016 (Annexure P-3) vide which despite the fact that the petitioner has already regularized his overdraft limit by clearing of the defaulted interest, still the Bank is trying to take physical possession of his residential property. Further prayer has been made to direct the respondent-Bank to upgrade the loan account of the petitioner.

2. Vide order dated February 16, 2017, the petitioner was directed to produce a demand draft of ₹ 2 lacs in favour of the respondent-Bank to show his bona fides but the same has not been complied with.

3. In such a situation, the petitioner is not entitled to any discretionary relief under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India and therefore, the present writ petition is dismissed.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

March 21, 2017
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No