



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

123-2

**CWP-19397-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 04.11.2025**

AMARDEEP SINGH PUREWAL

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, LUDHIANA AND ORS

...Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. V.K. Sachdeva, Advocate, (through V.C.)
Mr. Sahil Khunger, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Additional A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Rakshit Gupta, Advocate for respondent-Bank.

* * * *

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner, who is borrower/guarantor, has approached this Court challenging notices dated 11.10.2019 and 24.01.2020 (Annexures P-1 and P-2) issued u/s 13(2) and 13(4) of Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short SARFAESI Act), respectively as well as the order dated 02.08.2022 (Annexure P-6) issued u/s 14 of the SARFAESI Act, on various grounds.

2. 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).



3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. Interim relief granted in the present petition, shall continue till DRT takes fresh decision on the question of interim relief, provided the petitioner approaches 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.

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

8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

04.11.2025
S.Sharma

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