$~48

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010479762026**

\+ W.P.(C) 14741/2026

TECHNO TECH .....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Anurag Bhardwaj and Vipin Sharma, Advs.

versus

CANARA BANK .....Respondent

Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

O R D E R

% 05.10.2026

CM APPL. 69047/2026 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 14741/2026 & CM APPL. 69048/2026

1. The challenge in this writ petition emanates from an application filed before the DRT stating that the DRT does not have the pecuniary jurisdiction to entertain the O.A. as filed by the Bank.

2. The case of the Petitioner before the DRT was that the amount of money which is sought to be recovered in the OA, i.e., Rs.10,04,804/-, is highly inflated and has been sought only to bring the case within the pecuniary jurisdiction of the DRT. However, the order of the DRT shows that pursuant to the filing of the petition, the jurisdiction of the DRT had been increased from Rs.10 lakhs to Rs.20 lakhs and it was contended that

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 12/10/2026 at 11:40:49

the DRT did not have the jurisdiction to entertain this case. Paragraph 6 of the order of the DRT reads as under:-

> *"6. In the present matter, the defendants by way of filling the present application has raised the objection that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the present original application on the ground that the applicant bank has filed the present original application for the recovery of Rs.10,04,804/-, whereas this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the original application below the suit amount of Rs.20.00 lakhs. However, since, the Ministry of Finance vide notification dated 01.08.2019 has notified that the OA having suit value between Rs.10 lakhs to Rs.20 lakhs which have been filed before the DRT between 26.9.2018 and 30.6.2019 may continue in DRTs, whereas the present OA was filed on 17.11.2018, therefore, the present OA is maintainable before this Tribunal. Accordingly, present application stands dismissed, however, the issue of interest and penal interest etc. cannot be decided at this stage and the same shall be decided by this Tribunal at the time of final disposal of this matter after filling the evidences by the parties."*

3. In DRAT, it was stated that the initial amount of Rs.10 lakhs as claimed in the OA, i.e., Rs.10,04,804/-, was also inflated by adding interest contrary to law. Paragraph 4, which records the submission of the Petitioner, reads as under:-

> *"4. It is also stated that the appellants have claimed the interest on the contractual rate @ 9.15% per annum but the respondent has charged more than 18% on the crystallised capital. h is stated that if the interest is charged @ 9.15% per annum on the capital from the time of NPA then the outstanding dues against the appellants are less limn Rs.10.00 lacs and as such the*

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 12/10/2026 at 11:40:49

liability of the appellants is less than pecuniary jurisdiction of DRT. Accordingly, it is prayed that the DRT be directed to return back and to be filed before the court of competent jurisdiction."

4. The DRAT has rejected the appeal, stating that this would be a matter to be considered by the DRT by looking into the documents and in the trial. This Court does not find any infirmity in the order of the DRAT. However, this Court clarifies that it is open for the Petitioner herein to raise all the arguments regarding the pecuniary jurisdiction in the final hearing with reference to the documents on record and substantiate that the interest which has been levied on the Petitioner is contrary to law and was filed only to inflate the claim and to bring the claim of the bank within the pecuniary jurisdiction of the DRT and the DRT did not have the pecuniary jurisdiction to entertain the petition.

5. With these observations, the petition is disposed of along with pending application(s), if any.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not made any observation regarding the initial claim or as to whether the initial claim was inflated only to bring the claim of the bank within the pecuniary jurisdiction of the DRT.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

OCTOBER 5, 2026
hsk

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 12/10/2026 at 11:40:49