



CWP-21488-2021 (O&M)

1

108

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

CWP-21488-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.11.2025

SEEMA

....Petitioner

Versus

CAN FIN HOME LTD. AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Sube S. Kaushik, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner, who is borrower, has approached this Court challenging notice dated 04.10.2021 (Annexure P-7) issued u/s 13(4) of Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short 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. In view of the 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.

4. The petitioner is relegated to avail the appropriate statutory remedy under the SARFAESI Act before the DRT and thereafter before DRAT.



4.1 Before concluding, it would be appropriate to point out that SA/159/2021 had been filed by the petitioner on 13.10.2021, which was dismissed for want of prosecution on 17.03.2023 by DRT-II, Chandigarh.

4.2 Learned counsel for the petitioner informs that no attempt was made by the petitioner to revive the said SA/159/2021.

4.3 The petitioner is at liberty to revive the said SA/159/2021, subject to all reservations in law.

5. Interim relief 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.

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

7. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

12.11.2025

mohit goyal

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