

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 3244 OF 2026**

Shobha Pandharinath Shelke	...	Petitioner
vs.		
Union Bank of India	...	Respondent

Mr. Siddhesh R. Ghodke a/w. Mr. Swapnil K. for petitioner.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
 SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ**

DATE : 27th MARCH, 2026

P.C. :

. By this petition, the petitioner is seeking a direction from this Court in writ jurisdiction for the respondent-bank to accept the amount owed by the petitioner and to issue a no objection certificate in that regard.

2. The documents placed on record show that the respondent-bank had initiated recovery proceeding against the petitioner under the provisions of the Recovery of Debts and Bankruptcy Act, 1993.

3. As far back as on 05.12.2020, the Debts Recovery Tribunal-III, Mumbai had passed an order/decreed for recovery of substantial amounts against the petitioner.

4. The petitioner has not challenged the said order and hence, the respondent-bank must be proceeding to execute the said order/decreed.

5. In such a situation, the petitioner appears to be proposing to pay certain amount to respondent-bank to settle the dispute. By this petition, the petitioner is invoking writ jurisdiction to call upon this Court to issue a direction to the respondent-bank to virtually accept the proposal, so as to settle the dispute.

6. As per the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of *Bijnor Urban Co-operative Bank Limited, Bijnor and others vs. Meenal Agarwal and others*, (2023) 2 SCC 805, the writ Court cannot issue any direction to the creditor to accept proposal of settlement made by the debtor. It is for the parties to settle their disputes *inter se* and the writ Court cannot issue direction in that regard.

7. In view of the above, the writ petition is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)