



\$~72

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 19454/2025 & CM APPL. 81137/2025**

ASHISH WADHAWAN & ORS.Petitioners

Through: **Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate.**

versus

STATE BANK OF INDIARespondent

Through: **Mr. Hitendra M. and Mr. Alok Kumar
Rout, Advocates.**

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH**

ORDER

% **22.12.2025**

1. This writ petition is filed by the Petitioners under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

“(a) issue appropriate writ of mandamus and/ or any other writ or direction to the respondent to accept the one time settlement offer of Rs. 1,50,00,000/-, which stands already accepted and confirmed by the respondent thereby holding that the One Time Settlement proposal dated 11.09.2025 after the performance with the condition of encashment of cheque by the respondent bank is acceptance by conduct and thus a concluded contract, which binds the respondent;

(b) Pass such other or further orders I directions and grant such other reliefs in favour of the petitioner that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Hitendra M., learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondent.

4. From plain reading of the writ petition, it is evident that State Bank of India has issued notice dated 09.12.2025 to the Petitioner under Section



13(2) of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (SARFAESI Act) claiming an amount of Rs.2,58,38,885/-. In light of the law laid down by the Supreme Court including a recent order dated 10.09.2025 in ***Mohammad Zubair Ahmad v. Punjab National Bank & Anr.***, there is no doubt that in matters pertaining to cases under SARFAESI Act, High Courts should not exercise their writ jurisdiction since the jurisdiction lies with the Debt Recovery Tribunals. Hence, this writ petition cannot be entertained and is dismissed leaving it open to the Petitioners to take recourse to appropriate remedies before the appropriate forum.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and all rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

6. Pending application stands disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 22, 2025/RW