

\$~4

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

+ W.P.(C) 3483/2016, CM Nos. 14910/2016 and 28004/2016

SANJEEV GUPTA & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through

Mr. Gunjan Kumar and Mr. Prashant
Kumar, Advocates

versus

MURTI DEVI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through

Mr. Sunil K. Mittal and Mr. Kshitij
Mittal, Advs. for R-1
Ms. Bindu Das, Adv. for R-2/PNB

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDIRA BANERJEE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHAWLA

ORDER

%

21.02.2017

In this writ petition, the petitioner has impugned an order dated 28th March, 2016 passed by the Debts Recovery Appellate Tribunal ('DRAT'), Delhi.

The DRAT only recorded the submission of Counsel appearing for the respondent no. 1, that the latter had deposited a sum of Rs. 1.25 crores. The DRAT also recorded the submission of Counsel appearing on behalf of Punjab National Bank, that the bank had no objection in accepting the amount, provided the respondent no. 1 withdrew all the litigations. No final order was, however, passed and the matter was adjourned to 22nd April, 2016.

It is pertinent to note that the petitioners herein were not parties to the appeal proceedings at that stage. However, the petitioners have since been

added as parties in the original proceedings before the DRAT. By the order impugned herein, the proceedings before the DRAT have only been adjourned. If the petitioners have been impleaded as parties in the original proceedings, the petitioners would be permitted to appear and make submissions in the appeal as well. The petitioners may apply for formal impleadment and such application may be decided in accordance with law.

We find no ground at all to interfere with the impugned order passed by the DRAT. The petitioners may agitate all issues before the DRAT/DRT, as the case may be.

The present writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

Pending applications also stand disposed of.

INDIRA BANERJEE, J

ANIL KUMAR CHAWLA, J

FEBRUARY 21, 2017

sd