

AD. 34.
February 12, 2021.
MNS.

W. P. A. 22510 of 2019
(**Via video conference**)

Anil Kumar Singh
Vs.
UCO Bank and others

Mr. Abhirup Chakraborty

... for the petitioner.

Mr. Sailesh Mitra

...for the respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, during pendency of the writ petition, a sale notice was published in respect of the securities deposited by the petitioner with the respondent no. 1- bank. As such, the present writ petition has become infructuous.

It is further contended that the Debts Recovery Tribunal is not hearing the petitioner's challenge against the sale notice, under Section 17 of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002, in view of the pendency of the writ petition.

In such circumstances, W. P. A. 22510 of 2019 is dismissed as infructuous. The merits of the contentions raised herein are not gone into.

There will be no order as to costs.

Urgent photostat certified copies of this order, if applied for, be made available to the parties upon compliance with the requisite formalities.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)