



CWP-33313-2019 (O&M)

1

203

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

CWP-33313-2019 (O&M)**Date of decision: 16.10.2025**

M/S SPRINGZ AND ANOTHER

....Petitioners

Versus

ALLAHABAD BANK AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

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

Present: Ms. Harkirat S. Jagdev, Advocate for
Mr. Aalok Jagga, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Gaurav Goel, Advocate (Arguing counsel)
Mr. Teginder Singh, Advocate
for the respondent-Bank.

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners have approached this Court challenging notice dated 16.09.2019 (Annexure P-9) issued u/s 13(2) of Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short SARFAESI Act), on various grounds.

1.1. Thereafter, notice dated 28.03.2022 u/s 13(4) of SARFAESI Act was issued which has been challenged by way of application No.CM-5536-CWP-2022. Though the said challenge ought to have been raised by way of an amendment, but this Court for the time being ignores the mistake of the petitioners.

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 petitioners have availed the statutory alternative remedy of approaching the DRT and thereafter, before DRAT.

4. In view of the above and the view of 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 petitioners are relegated to avail the appropriate statutory remedy under the SARFAESI Act before the DRT and thereafter before DRAT. In case the petitioners prefer 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. 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

16.10.2025
mohit goyal

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