



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

119

CWP-31518-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 10.12.2025

MADHU ARORA

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE BANK OF INDIA AND ORS

...Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Ashok Malik, Advocate (arguing counsel)
Mr. Anshul Bajaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Chandeeep Singh, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr. Aalok Jagga, Advocate (arguing counsel)
Mr. Karan Inder Singh, Advocate,
Ms. Sangita Dhanda, Advocate for respondent Nos.5 and 6.

* * * *

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (Oral)

1. After hearing learned counsel for rival parties at length, this Court is of the considered view that certain adverse findings rendered by the DRT-II Delhi in SA-138-2023, especially the order passed on 10.07.2025 need not be interfered with, for the simple reason that the said DRT-II Delhi lies outside the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.
2. The petitioner, who is auction purchaser, always has the remedy of approaching the Delhi High Court or DRAT.
3. If the petitioner-auction purchaser avails the remedy before DRAT, the DRAT is expected to decide the appeal as expeditiously as possible.
4. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE**

10.12.2025*S.Sharma*

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