

25.11.2025
Item No.39
Court No.1
CHC

Calcutta High Court
In the Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri
Appellate Side

C.O. 75 of 2025

Sailen Das @ Shailen Das
Vs.
Punjab National Bank & Ors.

Mr. Avimannu Das, Advocate
...for the petitioner

Mr. Ratan Banik, Advocate
...for the Bank

1. Revisional application is directed against an order passed under Section 17 of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 in S.A. 44 of 2019.
2. There is a statutory alternative remedy of appeal available to the petitioner provided under the provisions of the Act of 2002. Petitioner chose not to avail of such statutory alternative remedy of appeal.
3. In the revisional application, what is contended is non-furnishing of the postal receipt. The same is an issue of fact.
4. The ground canvassed can also be raised by way of regular appeal which, the petitioner did chose not to avail of.
5. The impugned order was passed after hearing the parties. Lack of jurisdiction of the Debts Recovery

Tribunal is not established. The impugned order cannot be termed as perverse.

6. In such circumstances, I find no merit in this revisional application.

7. **C.O. 75 of 2025** is **dismissed**.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)