

2023:PHHC:115879-DB

120 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-19484-2023

Date of Decision: September 04, 2023

M/S JAI HARYANA TRADING COMPANY AND ANOTHER  
.... Petitioners

Versus

YES BANK AND OTHERS .... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Krishan Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

LISA GILL, J.

1. Prayer in this petition is for quashing order dated 01.07.2021 (Annexure P1) under Section 13(2) of Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short – ‘SARFAESI Act’) and notice dated 17.08.2023 (Annexure P2) issued by Sub Divisional Agriculture Officer, Kurukshetra. Further prayer is for restraining the respondents from taking possession of petitioners’ land/property in question. It is submitted that action taken against petitioners under the SARFAESI Act is illegal, arbitrary and violation of the provisions thereunder.

2. Heard.

3. Admittedly, 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**. 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.”

4. It is reiterated that no exceptional or extraordinary circumstance has been pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioners calling for interference by this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, this writ petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioners to avail remedy/remedies as available to them in accordance with law

6. It is clarified that there is no expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**(LISA GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

**(RITU TAGORE)**  
**JUDGE**

**September 04, 2023**  
rts

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