



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

225

CWP-1302-2022**Date of Decision:- 28.08.2025**

RAM SARUP

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

IDFC FIRST BANK AND ORS

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present: Mr. Arun Singal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Diksha Kakkar, Advocate for respondent No.1-Bank.

Mr. Ashwani Talwar, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Additional A.G. Haryana.

* * * *

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner, who is guarantor, has approached this Court challenging order dated 25.10.2021 (Annexure P-4) issued under Section 14 of Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short SARFAESI Act), on various grounds.

2. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 informs that the auction purchasers, who have a sale certificate dated 31.03.2021 in their favour in respect of the secured asset, are already in possession.

3. The Apex Court has consistently held that High Courts should refrain from interfering under Article 226 of the Constitution in SARFAESI proceedings. The SARFAESI Act, 2002 is a complete code which not only provides for a detailed recovery mechanism but also remedies before the Debts Recovery Tribunal (DRT) and thereafter, Debts Recovery Appellate



Tribunal (DRAT).

4. From the averments in the petition, it does not appear that the petitioner has availed the statutory alternative remedy of approaching the DRT and/or DRAT.

5. In view of above and the ratio laid down by Apex Court in **United Bank of India vs. Satyawati Tondon, (2010) AIR SC 3413 (Para 17, 27); Phoenix ARC Private Limited vs. Vishwa Bharati Vidya Mandir and others, (2022) 5 SCC 345 (Paras 10, 21); PHR Invent Educational Society versus UCO Bank and others, 2024 (6) SCC 579 (Paras 22 to 41)**, this Court refrains from exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of Constitution.

6. The petitioner is relegated to avail the appropriate statutory remedy under the SARFAESI Act before the DRT and thereafter before DRAT. In case the petitioner prefers an application under Section 17 of SARFAESI Act within a period of 30 days from today along with copy of this order, the same shall be considered and decided on its own merits, without being dismissed on limitation alone.

7. Interim relief, if granted, in the present petition, shall continue till the DRT takes fresh decision on the question of interim relief, provided the petitioner approaches the DRT within 30 days, failing which the interim relief shall lose its effect. It is made clear that if petitioner approaches the Tribunal within the prescribed stipulated time, then this order shall not prejudice the mind of Tribunal while deciding the question of interim relief, if admissible to the petitioner. We further make it clear that the Tribunal shall decide the request for interim relief strictly on merits of the matter, without being influenced by the fact of petitioner having approached this



Court or this Court having passed the present order.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of with aforesaid liberty without commenting on merits, without cost.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

28.08.2025
S.Sharma

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No