

09/01
2026

AD-04/24
266312
NANDY

(DO)

**In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

WPA 131 of 2026

**BAPI SIKDER
Vs.
THE UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

Ms. Priya Ghosal, Advocate

.....for the Petitioner

Ms. Parna Roy Choudhury, Advocate

Ms. Trisa Chanda, Advocate

.....for the Punjab National Bank

1. Affidavit of service, as filed, be kept with the record.
2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the acts of commission and/or omission by the respondent Bank in taking action under the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (in short, the said Act). The petitioner submits that in spite of a proposal given by the petitioner to settle his account for an aggregate sum of Rs.16 lakhs, the same was not accepted by the Bank. The petitioner has not paid the entirety of Rs.16 lakhs as offered by him.
3. Mr. Roy Choudhury, learned Advocate appearing for the Bank, submits that the instant petition has become infructuous as the mortgaged property has already been sold, as will appear from the 'sale intimation letter' dated 17.12.2025, a copy whereof is taken on record, without any challenge from the petitioner.
4. In fact, an application under Section 17 of the said Act filed before the Debts Recovery Tribunal merely challenges the possession notice and not the sale notice, which has been issued by the Bank.
5. The petitioner is at liberty to pray for an early hearing and disposal of the pending application before the Debts Recovery Tribunal, if so advised.

6. With this observation, **WPA 131 of 2026** is **disposed of**.
There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)