

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

**208**

**CWP-29435-2019 (O&M)  
Date of Decision : 17.2.2021**

**Eee & Cee Pressing Pvt. Ltd. .... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Corporation Bank and others ..... Respondents**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI  
: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ  
\*\*\***

Present :- Mr. Pankaj Jain, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mahesh Dhir, Advocate  
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Harish Chhabra, Advocate  
for respondent No.3.

**\*\*\***

**AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)**

1. This writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari or direction quashing the impugned notice dated 4.7.2019 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 13 (2) of Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short 'the Act') and dated 30.9.2019 (Annexure P-3-A) issued under Section 13 (4) of the Act whereby possession notice has been issued for immovable properties as detailed in the petition without deciding representation filed by the petitioner.

2. Additional affidavit dated 17.2.2021 of Upender Rai, S/o  
Sohan Lal, Authorised Officer, Branch Manager, Union Bank of India

(Erstwhile-Corporation Bank) SCO No.302, Sector-9, Panchkula has been filed on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2.

3. In view of the affidavit, learned counsel for the petitioner states that he would approach the DRT but prays that the interim order which was granted by this Court may be continued for one week more.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 has reservations and states that no interim protection could have been allowed by this Court in any case because the SARFAESI is a complete Code.

5. We have noticed the contention of the learned counsel for respondent No.1 but keeping the mind the limited nature of the prayer which has been made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, we do not deem it appropriate to deny the same and consequently, while dismissing this petition and relegating the petitioner to his remedy under the SARFAESI Act we direct that the interim order shall be continued for one week from today.

6. Petition stands dismissed with above-said observations.

7. Since the main case has been dismissed, the pending application, if any, also stands dismissed.

**(AJAY TEWARI)**  
**JUDGE**

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**17.2.2021**  
**anuradha**

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | - | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | - | Yes/No |