



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

129

CWP-10496-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.05.2026

CANARA BANK

...Petitioner

Versus

DEBT RECOVERY TRIBUNAL III CHANDIGARH AND ORS

...Respondents

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

Present:- Ms. Rahish Pawha, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. C.S. Pasricha, Advocate with
Mr. Saurabh Sudhir Bainsla, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 06.04.2026, this Court passed the following order:-

“Counsel for the petitioner-Bank states that SA (Securitization Application) filed by respondent No.2 has been allowed by the DRT-III, vide order dated 31.01.2026 (Annexure P-1) and petitioner-Bank has filed an appeal before the DRAT, which is pending, but it has not been heard so far. She states that hearing of the appeal could not take place as the incumbent, who has been offered appointment to the post of Chairperson, DRAT, is to join the post on or before 30.04.2026. Counsel asserts that in the meanwhile, impugned order dated 31.01.2026 (Annexure P-1) is being executed and vide order dated 01.04.2026 (Annexure P-3), title deeds of the property have been ordered to be returned back to respondent No.2. She asserts that in case the impugned order dated 31.01.2026 (Annexure P-1) is implemented, the petitioner-Bank will suffer an irreparable loss.



Issue notice of motion to the respondents, returnable for 05.05.2026.

In the meanwhile, the operation of the impugned orders (Annexures P-1 and P-3) shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

2. At the outset, Ms. Rahish Pahwa states that the regular incumbent has joined the Debts Recovery Appellate Tribunal (for short ‘DRAT’), which is functioning since 17.04.2026. She states that appeal filed by petitioner has now been deferred to 20.05.2026. She submits that petitioner would move an appropriate application for interim relief before DRAT prior to the aforesaid date and interim protection granted by this Court be extended till then.

3. Writ petition has been hotly contested by Mr. Pasricha, who has filed written statement on behalf of respondent No.2. It is his assertion that petitioner has misled this Court while securing order dated 06.04.2026. He, however, concedes that DRAT is now functioning regularly.

4. In view of above, writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to move an appropriate application for interim relief before DRAT, which may be heard on or before the next date. Interim order passed by this Court on 06.04.2026 shall continue till 20.05.2026.

5. It is clarified that in case, an appropriate application is moved by petitioner before DRAT, the same shall be decided on its own merits, uninfluenced by the observations made in the above reproduced order. It is also clarified that in case the petitioner is not able to get any interim relief



from DRAT on or before 20.05.2026, execution proceedings shall continue.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

May 05, 2026
harish

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

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