

CWP No.6324 of 2015 (O&M)

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

CWP No.6324 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.04.2017

Tej Kaur and others

....Petitioners

Versus

Sub Divisional Officer (Civil), Pehowa and others

....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Mahavir Sandhu, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Gaurav Bansal, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Vipul Dharmani, Advocate, for respondent No.2.
Mr. Sanjay Dhiman, Advocate, for respondents No.3 to 5.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

Dispute in the present writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India relates to the order dated 11.09.2014 (Annexure P-1) whereby the application under Section 8 of the Haryana Agricultural Credit Operations & Miscellaneous Provisions (Banks) Act, 1973 read with amended Act of 1978 filed by respondent No.2 – bank was allowed and an amount of ₹ 6,76,426/- including interest till 26.08.2013 was held payable by the petitioners and respondents No.3 to 5.

2. During the pendency of the writ petition, petitioners as well as respondents No.3 to 5 have cleared the aforesaid amount. This fact was not disputed by learned counsel for the bank as 'No Dues Certificate' dated 13.04.2017 has been produced by him. The same is taken on record. It has been stated in the aforesaid certificate that the loan accounts are closed and

CWP No.6324 of 2015 (O&M)

revenue authority.

3. In view of the above, learned counsel for the parties submitted that present writ petition has been rendered infructuous and may be disposed of as such.

4. Ordered accordingly.

5. However, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that in view of various interim orders passed by this Court, petitioners have deposited the amount of their share and part of share of respondents No.3 to 5. A prayer was made that liberty be granted to the petitioners to take steps for recovery of the same from respondents No.3 to 5. However, this fact was disputed by learned counsel for respondents No.3 to 5.

6. Be that as it may, it shall be open to the petitioners to take recourse to the remedies as may be available to them for recovery of amount, if any, against respondents No.3 to 5 in accordance with law.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

April 18, 2017
R.S.

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No