



130

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

**CWP-11128-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.04.2026**

**M/S ATMA RAM RICE AND GENERAL MILLS CHEEKA AND
OTHERS**

...Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present: Mr. K.B. Raheja, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate with
Mrs. Monika Thatai, Advocate
Ms. Shruti Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Karan Sharma, Advocate
for respondents No.4 and 5.

Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Haryana.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present writ petition has been filed, inter alia, for the issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondent No.2- Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Kaithal to initiate proceedings against fraud allegedly committed by the Bank-respondent No.5. A further prayer has been made for setting aside the order dated 17.03.2026 (Annexure P-4) passed by Debt Recovery Tribunal (for short "DRT"). Along with the writ petition, petitioners have also moved a miscellaneous application for appointment of Local Commissioner.

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



3. Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate has put in appearance of behalf of respondents No.4 and 5 and states that three different loans were availed by the petitioners and upon default in repayment, proceedings were initiated under the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002. He submits that possession of some of the mortgaged properties were taken over and they have been put to auction. He has instructions to state that a sale certificate dated 18.03.2026 has been issued but an amount of Rs.4,30,00,000/- is yet to be recovered from the petitioners. He states that a securitization application preferred by petitioners is pending before DRT and petitioners have a remedy for filing an appeal against the impugned order, Annexure P-4.

4. In view of the above developments, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extraordinary writ jurisdiction vested in it under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. As such, there is no merit in the writ petition, the same is dismissed.

5. Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

10.04.2026

Priyanka Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No