



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

(110)

CWP-8981-2026

Date of decision:- 24.04.2026

M/s Sadashiv Casting Pvt. Ltd. and others

... Petitioners

Versus

Reserve Bank of India and others

... Respondents

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

Present:- Ms. Sidhi Bansal, Advocate, Ms. Ridhi Bansal, Advocate,
Mr. Sagar Pathania, Advocate, Mr. Viney Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. Abhav Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Indresh Goel, Advocate, for respondent No.1-RBI.

Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate and Ms. Monika Thatai, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 17.04.2026, this Court passed the following order:-

“Counsel for the petitioners has inter alia contended that the petitioner had submitted a reply, Annexure P-10, to the show cause notice, Annexure P-9, but the same has not been considered while passing the impugned order, Annexure P-13, whereby petitioner has been declared as a fraud. She has made a reference to the postal receipts as well as the postal envelop (Page No.147-A to 147-C of the paperbook) to fortify her submission.

Advance copy of the petition has been served upon the respondents.

Mr. Indresh Goel, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1 – RBI, whereas Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate, has appeared on virtual platform for respondent No.2.

Counsel for respondent No.2 requests for short accommodation to get instructions.

List on 24.04.2026.”



2. Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate, who is representing respondent No.2, states that the reply dated 24.12.2025, Annexure P-10, submitted by petitioner, was duly acknowledged and a rejoinder was sent to petitioners as well as their counsel on 09.01.2026 by speed post. He, however, concedes that due to inadvertence, impugned order does not contain any reference to the reply filed by petitioners to the show cause notice. He has instructions from Sh. Shiv Kant Tyagi, Legal Department, to withdraw the impugned order dated 04.02.2026, Annexure P-13, with liberty to pass a fresh order in accordance with law.

3. As the impugned order has been withdrawn, writ petition has become infructuous and is dismissed as such.

4. Liberty is granted to respondent No.2 to pass a fresh order after affording an opportunity of hearing to petitioners in accordance with law. Liberty is also granted to petitioners to file a comprehensive response, which respondent No.2 shall consider before passing an order.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

24.04.2026
Kamal

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No