
(2009) 11 P&H CK 0198
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 17437 of 2009

M/s. Shree Ganesh Woolen Mills, Amritsar and Others	APPELLANT
Vs	
Punjab National Bank	RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 13-11-2009

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226
Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (SARFAESI) — Section 13(2), 13(3), 13(4), 17

Citation : (2009) 11 P&H CK 0198

Hon'ble Judges : Satish Kumar Mittal, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Rohit Suri, for the Appellant;

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Satish Kumar Mittal, J.—M/s.Shree Ganesh Woolen Mills, village Naueshera Nangli, Amritsar and its partners have filed the instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for quashing the two demand notices dated 02.09.2009 (Annexure P8) and 20.10.2009 (Annexure P9), issued u/s 13(2) of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") as well as the possession notice dated 03.11.2009 (Annexure P11), issued u/s 13(4) of the Act.

2. When the petitioner firm did not repay the loan amount in terms of the agreement and willfully defaulted in payment, its account was declared as NPA on 28.08.2009, and thereafter, the respondent bank proceeded under the provisions of the Act and issued demand notices dated 02.09.2000 and 20.10.2009 u/s 13(2) of the Act, which were duly served on the petitioner firm. The petitioners filed objections dated 03.11.2009 (Annexure P10) u/s 13(3) of the Act, and thereafter the respondent bank issued the possession notice dated 03.11.2009 (Annexure P11) u/s 13(4) of the Act.

3. After hearing counsel for the petitioner, I am of the opinion that against the

impugned notice (Annexure P11), the petitioners have the remedy of appeal before the Debts Recovery Tribunal u/s 17 of the Act, which has not been availed by them and the instant petition has been filed. In para 32 of the writ petition, it has been stated that the petitioners have filed the petition, because the respondent bank is going to take possession of the secured assets on the basis of the letter dated 03.11.2009, without issuing a possession notice. This fact is not correct. The letter dated 03.11.2009 is a possession notice issued by the respondent bank u/s 13(4) of the Act and against the said letter/action/order, the petitioners have the remedy to file appeal before the Debts Recovery Tribunal u/s 17 of the Act. The pleas which have been raised in this petition can be raised by the petitioners before the Debts Recovery Tribunal. Therefore, in view of the availability of the effective remedy of appeal against the impugned action of the respondent bank, I am not inclined to entertain this petition.

Dismissed.