



\$~23

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

+ **W.P.(C) 525/2026**

GAGAN JAIN & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Anant Gautam, Mr. Rishi
Chauhan, Mr. Vibhu Sharma
and Mr. Aman Gahlot, Advs.

versus

BANK OF BARODA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Brijesh Kumar Tamber and
Mr. Yashu Rustagi, Advs. for
R-1 & 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK CHAUDHARY

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHAIL JAIN

ORDER

% **15.01.2026**

CM APPL. 2642-43/2026 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The present applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 525/2026 AND CM APPLs. 2641/2026 & 2739/2026

3. The present writ petition has been filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India seeking following reliefs:

“A. Issue a writ of mandamus/ certiorari or any other appropriate writ/direction/order for quashing the order dated 02.05.2025 and 05.05.2025 passed by the Ld. DRAT in Appeal no. 89 of 2025; and or

B. Issue a writ of mandamus/certiorari or any other appropriate writ/ direction/order dismissing the Appeal no. 89 of 2025; and/or



In the alternate:

C. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ/direction/order for directing the Ld. Debt Recovery Appellate Tribunal to decide/dispose of the Regular Appeal no. 89 of 2025 in a time bound manner, as expeditiously as possible; and/or

D. Pass such other and further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts of the present case.”

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, who are the auction purchasers, submits that there is grave urgency in the matter, inasmuch as the Bank is not proceeding to enter into a One Time Settlement (OTS) with the borrowers. It is contended that despite a request having been made by way of a *praecipe*, the urgency has not been appreciated and the stay application is not being taken up for hearing.

5. We have considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners. In the facts and circumstances, the petitioners are permitted to prefer an appropriate application, duly supported by an affidavit, before the learned Debt Recovery Appellate Tribunal (DRAT), setting out the urgency in the matter.

6. In the event such an application is filed, the learned Tribunal shall positively consider and hear the urgency application within a period of two weeks and pass an appropriate order thereon. If urgency is found to exist, the DRAT is expected to proceed further and grant hearing to the parties, in accordance with law.



7. With the aforesaid directions, the present petition stands disposed of.
8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

VIVEK CHAUDHARY, J

SHAIL JAIN, J

JANUARY 15, 2026

p/kp/tr