

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

CWP-18183-2023

Date of Decision: August 21, 2023

Raghav Mehra and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

HDFC Bank Limited and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RITU TAGORE**

Present: Mr. Vishal Moudgill, Advocate for the petitioners.

LISA GILL, J.

1. Prayer in this writ petition is for quashing notice dated 08.08.2023 (Annexure P2) under Section 13(2) of Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short – ‘SARFAESI Act’).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that loan facility was availed of by the petitioners in the year 2020 and property in question was mortgaged with the respondent – Bank. Default had occurred in payments in the year 2014, however, petitioners have been paying installments regularly thereafter. Proceedings under the SARFAESI Act, it is submitted, have been wrongly initiated against the petitioners.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners insists that possession notice dated 08.08.2023 is infact the first notice issued to the petitioners It is

submitted that such a course could not have been adopted by the respondent – Bank. It was incumbent upon the respondent – Bank to have first issued notice under Section 13(2) of SARFAESI Act. Apart from the fact that document attached as Annexure P-1 with this writ petition is not even complete, learned counsel for the petitioners, when faced with mention of demand notice dated 26.07.2014 under Section 13(2) of SARFAESI Act in the said notice, is unable to give any details as to when loan in question was regularized, as has been contended, may be after issuance of said notice dated 26.07.2014, neither is there anything on record to indicate that petitioners have since then been depositing the instalments regularly.

4. Be that as it may, without even delving on the correctness or otherwise of the averments by the petitioners, in our considered opinion, petitioners have an alternate efficacious remedy for redressal of the grievance/s raised in this writ petition. It is a settled position of law that as a general rule, there would be no interference by the High Court in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in the wake of availability of efficacious alternate remedy to the litigant, except in exceptional circumstances. Gainful reference in this regard can be made to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Union Bank of India v. Satyawati Tandon and others, 2010(8) SCC 110; Varimadugu Obi Reddy v. B. Sreenivasulu and others, 2023(1) R.C.R.(Civil) 34; M/s South Indian bank Ltd. and others v. Naveen Mathew Philip and another, 2023(2) RCR (Civil) 771** and Division Bench judgment of this High Court in **CWP No.10738 of 2022 (M/s Harinder Fabrics v. Shriram**

City Union Finance Ltd.) decided on 04.05.2023. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of **M/s South Indian Bank** (supra) held as under:-

“13. We may, however, reiterate the settled position of law on the interference of the High Court invoking Article 226 of the Constitution of India in commercial matters, where an effective and efficacious alternative forum has been constituted through a statute.

xxx

xxx

xxx

14. A writ of certiorari is to be issued over a decision when the Court finds that the process does not conform to the law or statute. In other words, courts are not expected to substitute themselves with the decision-making authority while finding fault with the process along with the reasons assigned. Such a writ is not expected to be issued to remedy all violations.

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

15. The object and reasons behind the Act 54 of 2002 are very clear as observed by this Court in **Mardia Chemicals Ltd. v. Union of India, (2004) 4 SCC 311**. While it facilitates a faster and smoother mode of recovery sans any interference from the Court, it does provide a fair mechanism in the form of the Tribunal being manned by a legally trained mind. The Tribunal is clothed with a wide range of powers to set aside an illegal order and thereafter, grant consequential reliefs, including re-possession and payment of compensation and costs. Section 17(1) of the SARFAESI Act gives an expansive meaning to the expression “any person”, who could approach the Tribunal.

xxx

xxx

xxx

18. While doing so, we are conscious of the fact that the powers conferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India are rather wide but are required to be exercised only in extraordinary circumstances in matters pertaining to

proceedings and adjudicatory scheme qua a statute, more so in commercial matters involving a lender and a borrower, when the legislature has provided for a specific mechanism for appropriate redressal.”

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners is unable to point out any extraordinary or exceptional circumstances which call for interference in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, this writ petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioners to avail remedy/remedies available to them in accordance with law. It is clarified that there is no expression of opinion on the merits of the matter.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

(RITU TAGORE)
JUDGE

August 21, 2023

rts

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No