



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

261

CWP-8522-2026

Date of Decision: 23.04.2026

RAJ RANI

...Petitioner

Versus

CAN FIN HOMES LIMITED AND ORS

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present:- Mr. Krishan Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohan Mittal, Advocate, for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This writ petition has been filed *inter alia* for issuance of a writ of *certiorari* for quashing of notices and orders passed under the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short, 'the SARFAESI Act').

2. On 25.03.2026, this Court passed the following order:-

“Upon instructions, Mr. Rohan Mittal, Advocate, who is representing respondents No.1 and 2 states that the finance company will hold its hands for a fortnight from today and not take possession of the residential house provided the petitioner comes forward and makes an initial deposit as well as moves appropriate application for one time settlement (OTS).

List on 23.04.2026.

Let the petitioner make a deposit of Rs.5 lakhs as offered by the counsel for the petitioner and recorded by this Court in order dated 20.03.2026 within a fortnight and move an appropriate application with respondents No.1 and 2 for settlement.”



3. Counsel representing the financial institution-respondent Nos.1 and 2 states that although petitioner submitted an application for consideration of the case under the OTS Scheme but she did not make deposit Rs.5,00,000/- as directed by this Court. Counsel states that as petitioner failed to make the deposit, her application could not be considered.

4. Above reproduced order dated 25.03.2026 was passed by this Court to extend some relief to the petitioner as the offer made on her behalf appeared to be genuine, however, despite grant of opportunity, petitioner has not come forward to make a deposit. Petitioner has an alternate remedy of approaching DRT under the SARFAESI Act. Writ petition before this Court is not maintainable and is dismissed as such.

5. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to take recourse to the remedy available to her, in accordance with law.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

April 23, 2026
harish

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No