

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

CWP No. 1764 of 2021

Date of decision : 9.2.2021

M/s Asset Reconstruction Company (India) Limited ... Petitioner

versus

District Magistrate, Ludhiana and others ... Respondents

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jaswant Singh
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sant Parkash**

Present Mr. Nitin Grover, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Ms. Anu Pal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

[The aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing
since the proceedings are being conducted in virtual court.]

Jaswant Singh, J. (Oral)

The Petitioner- M/s Asset Reconstruction Company having been assigned the debt by the South Indian Bank Limited in the year 2013, had filed an application under Section 14 of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Securities Interest Act, 2002, before the District Magistrate, Ludhiana, which was allowed vide order dated 19.3.2014, directing the Commissioner Police, Ludhiana to provide necessary help to the Tehsildar, Ludhiana (E) for taking the physical possession of property measuring 306 square yards, situated at B-XXII 4038/899/47, Sherpur Kalan comprised in Khasra No. 7//8/2/1/1 Khata No. 309/316 as per Jamabandi for the year 1973-74 registered vide sale deed no. 1963 dated 25.1.1977.

After almost seven years, the present writ petition was filed by the M/s Asset Reconstruction Company seeking a direction for implementing the aforesaid order.

This Court on 27.1.2021 has directed the learned State counsel to cross check the factual position.

At the time of resumed hearing, Ms. Anu Pal, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, on instructions from Mr. Gurmit Singh, Tehsildar, Ludhiana (East), submits that the delay in implementing the order is explained in para 13 of the writ petition itself, which revealed that there was possibility of settlement between the parties. She further states that necessary assistance was directed to be provided for handing over the physical possession of the property in question on 8.2.2021, when no officer of the company appeared. She states that next date for doing the needful after due intimation to the parties concerned has been fixed for **12.2.2021**.

In view of the above, we dispose of the present writ petition as infructuous with the direction to the authorities concerned to be bound by the aforesaid stand given through their counsel.

(Jaswant Singh)
Judge

9.2.2021
vs

(Sant Parkash)
Judge

Whether speaking/ reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No