

\$~7 & 8

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
+ LPA 167/2017

RAGHAV BUILDCON PRIVATE LIMITED Appellant
Through: Mr. Hrishikesh Baruah with Mr.
Pranav Jain, Ms. Radhika Gupta,
Mr. Kshitij Paliwal & Mr. Siddhant
Kaushik, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC with
Mr. Aditya Goyal, Advocate for R1
Mr. H S Parihar, Mr. Kuldeep S
Parihar, Advocate for RBI
Mr. Sanjay Bajaj, Mr. Ajay Bahl
And Ms. Rigasha Takkar, Advocate
For R-3/Punjab & Sindh Bank

+ LPA 172/2017 & CM APPL. Nos. 43312-43313/2017

MASCOT BUILDCON PRIVATE LIMITED Appellant
Through: Mr. Hrishikesh Baruah with Mr.
Pranav Jain, Ms. Radhika Gupta,
Mr. Kshitij Paliwal & Mr. Siddhant
Kaushik, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC with
Mr. Aditya Goyal, Advocate for R1
Mr. H S Parihar, Mr. Kuldeep S
Parihar, Advocate for RBI
Mr. Sanjay Bajaj, Mr. Ajay Bahl
And Ms. Rigasha Takkar, Advocate
For R-3/Punjab & Sindh Bank

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

9

%

ORDER
28.11.2017


After some hearing, we are of the opinion that the impugned order, which ruled out the maintainability of the Writ Petition on the ground of availability of the efficacies and alternative remedy by way of a Suit, cannot be faulted with.

In the event, the appellant approaches the Civil Court in an appropriate proceeding, he will be entitled to the benefit of Section 14 of the Limitation Act, 1963, on the issue of limitation to the extent of time spent, in the prosecution of the Writ Petition and the present appeal.

All the rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

The appeal is disposed of in view of the aforesaid.


S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J


SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

NOVEMBER 28, 2017/P