



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

CWP-7709-2026

Date of decision : 13.03.2026

Harwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

**Debt Recovery Tribunal-III, Chandigarh
and another**

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Karan Bhardwaj, Advocate,
Mr. Pardeep Kumar and Mr. Ishaan, Advocates
for the petitioner.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(Oral)

1. Petitioner has assailed order dated 26.09.2025 (Annexure P-8) passed by the Debts Recovery Tribunal (DRT-III), Chandigarh on the ground that it does not have territorial jurisdiction. He has made a reference to notification dated 04.10.2022 (Annexure P-7) to contend that the territorial jurisdiction pertaining to matters arising from the State of Haryana as well as the Union Territory, Chandigarh is with DRT-II, Chandigarh. He contends that the Bank has deliberately moved an application before the DRT-III instead of moving an application before the appropriate Tribunal.

2. Be that as it may, as impugned order has already been implemented and possession of the mortgaged vehicle has been taken, no purpose would be served in issuing notice to the respondents. However, as

petitioner has raised an argument that DRT-III does not have jurisdiction and OA is pending, liberty is given to him to move an appropriate application for transfer.

3. In case, any such application is moved by petitioner, it shall be determined before proceeding further in the matter. Liberty is also given to the petitioner to raise all the available pleas before the Tribunal concerned.
4. Petition is disposed of.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

13.03.2026
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No