

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

109

CWP-20980-2020

Date of Decision: 25.03.2021

UCO Bank

...Petitioner

Versus

District Magistrate, Bathinda and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA.
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH.

PRESENT: Mr. Sumit Batra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Anju Arora, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

RAJAN GUPTA, J. (Oral)

Case has been heard through Video Conferencing on account of COVID-19 Pandemic.

Only grievance of the petitioner-Bank is that the order has been passed by the District Magistrate under Section 14 of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002. However, the same is not being implemented.

We, thus, propose that the Bank may make a representation to the District Magistrate which may be decided at the earliest. Learned State counsel has no objection to this.

Under these circumstances, writ petition is disposed of with the observation that in case the Bank makes a representation to the District Magistrate within two weeks from today, same shall be decided by way of a speaking order within two weeks thereafter.

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

March 25, 2021
gbs

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No