

\$~37

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

+ W.P.(C) 6677/2017

M/S GEE ISPAT PVT LTD AND ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Ms Pratiti Rungta and Mr Sumit,
Adv.

versus

CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA

..... Respondent

Through: Mr O.P. Gaggar, Adv

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

04.08.2017

The petitioners are aggrieved by the act of the respondent / bank; contention is that although recovery proceeding are pending before Debt Recovery Tribunal under the Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 and the petitioners owe money to the respondent bank yet the act of the bank in holding the *Dharna* in front of the house of respondent Nos. 2 and 5 was totally not called for. She has placed photographs on record to substantiate this submission. Her additional submission is that although complaint was made in the local police station yet no action had been taken by the police inspite of the fact that this was a clear case of criminal intimidation qua the petitioners. Learned counsel for the respondent

has put in appearance on advance notice. His submission is that this petition is not maintainable. No direction can be given by this court. This court endorses the submission of the learned counsel for the respondent. This court is of the view that the present petition in the present form is not maintainable; this court is not a fact finding court. The petitioners may approach the local police or may take appropriate steps by initiating civil proceedings.

Petition dismissed.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

AUGUST 04, 2017
SU