



\$~1 & 2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 2529/2026, CM APPL. 12261/2026 & CM APPL.
12263/2026

NURAY REALTECH PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Pallav Saxena with Mr. Apoorv
Agarwal, Ms. Saloni Singh & Mr.
Anuj Maheswari, Advs.

versus

PUNJAB AND SIND BANK & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Sanjiv Kakra Sr. Adv. with
Rajinder Wali for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Anil Airi, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Aansi
Pathak, Mr. Abhishek Batra, Advs. for
R-2.

2

+ W.P.(C) 2551/2026, CM APPL. 12387/2026 & CM APPL.
12389/2026

UBA REALTECH PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhir Nandrajog, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Apoorv Agarwal, Ms. Saloni
Singh & Mr. Anuj Maheshwari, Advs.

versus

PUNJAB AND SIND BANK & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Sanjiv Kakra Sr. Adv. with
Rajinder Wali for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Anil Airi, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Aansi
Pathak, Mr. Abhishek Batra, Advs. for
R-2.



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK CHAUDHARY
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

ORDER
27.02.2026

%

1. The present Petitions have been preferred under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeking to set aside the impugned Order dated 09.01.2026 passed by the learned Debts Recovery Tribunal–I, New Delhi in S.A. No. 527 of 2023 titled “*M/s Nuray Realtech Private Limited vs. Punjab and Sind Bank & Ors.*” and in S.A. No. 528 of 2023 titled “*M/s Uba Realtech Private Limited vs. Punjab and Sind Bank & Ors.*”, in view of the non-functional status of the learned Debts Recovery Appellate Tribunal (DRAT), rendering the statutory appellate remedy inefficacious, along with supporting affidavit.
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Core grievance of the petitioner would substantially be met in case, the petitioner is permitted to file an urgency/early hearing application before the concerned Debt Recovery Appellate Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as, ‘DRAT’), with direction to concerned DRAT to decide the securitisation application expeditiously and in accordance with law, without any unnecessary adjournments.
4. Looking into the facts and circumstances of the present case, we find that such a discretion can be exercised and accordingly, the petitioners are permitted to file an appropriate application with regard to their urgency before



the concerned DRAT.

5. As soon as the application is filed, we expect that the concerned DRAT shall consider the same and decide the securitisation application expeditiously, without granting unnecessary adjournments, in accordance with law.

6. With the aforesaid observation, the petitions along with pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

VIVEK CHAUDHARY, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2026

yk/kp/tr