

03.07.2023
Item No.35
Court No.32
Avijit Mitra

FMAT 200 of 2023
with
IA No. CAN 1 of 2023
with
IA No. CAN 2 of 2023
Tata Motors Finance Limited
Versus
Binod Pandit

Mr. Pratip Mukherjee,
Mr. Sayak Ranjan Ganguly,
Ms. Srijani Ghosh
.....for the appellant

Mr. Prinkwar Saha,
Mr. Lalmohan Mondal
.....for the respondent

Affidavit of service filed by the appellant be kept on record.

This application has been taken out praying for condonation of delay in preferring the appeal.

Upon hearing the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties and upon considering the materials on record placed before us, we are satisfied with the explanation given towards the delay in preferring the appeal.

Accordingly, such delay is condoned and the application being IA No. CAN 1 of 2023 is disposed of.

The appellant has assailed the order no.2 dated 15th March, 2023 passed by the learned Judge, City Civil Court, Calcutta in Title Suit No.510 of 2023 whereby the learned Court below by passing an *ad interim* order of injunction restrained the appellant and its men from

seizing and/or taking over possession of the vehicle bearing registration no.BR – 10GB - 0696 save and except due process of law, till the next date.

Mr. Mukherjee, learned advocate appearing for the appellant submits that the respondent availed of financial assistance extended to him on the basis of a hire-purchase agreement entered into by and between the parties hereto. The said hire-purchase agreement contains one arbitration clause and the appellant has invoked the arbitration clause and the dispute cropped up by and between the parties was referred to arbitration and even award has been passed but suppressing all these facts and claiming that the appellant has practised fraud upon the respondent, the suit has been instituted by the respondent.

Mr. Mukherjee further contends that along with plaint, one application under Or. 39 Rule 1 & 2 of the Code has also been filed and in that application, one blanket order of injunction has been passed restraining the appellant from taking possession of the vehicle. He submits that the respondent is a habitual defaulter and has not paid the instalments as agreed upon. He further submits stating all these facts the appellant has filed an application under Order VII Rule 11 of the Code before the learned Court below and the said application is pending for final adjudication. He submits that this Court can direct the learned Court below to dispose of that

application for rejection of plaint as early as possible.

Mr. Saha, learned advocate appearing for the respondent denies and disputes such contention. He submits that no copy of the agreement has ever been supplied to the respondent and he submits that the agreement does not contain the signature of the respondent and consequently, the terms and conditions of the agreement are not binding on the respondent. However, he accepts the proposal given by Mr. Mukherjee and submits that if the learned Court below is directed to dispose of the application for rejection of plaint expeditiously he shall have no objection.

Having considered such submissions of the parties and taking note of the subsequent event, we direct the learned court below to dispose of the application for rejection of plaint as expeditiously as possible without granting unnecessary adjournments to either of the parties thereto.

The ad-*interim* order of injunction impugned in the present appeal is not interfered with by this Court.

Accordingly, the appeal and the application being IA No. CAN 2 of 2023 are disposed of.

There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the learned advocates for the parties.

(Partha Sarathi Chatterjee, J.) (Tapabrata Chakraborty, J.)