



CWP-27562-2025

1

123

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

CWP-27562-2025

Date of decision: 16.09.2025

BABA BHAGWANT BHAJAN SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

DEBTS RECOVERY APPELLATE TRIBUNAL AND OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present: Mr. Manuj Nagrath, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner, who is a borrower, has filed present petition seeking various reliefs which are reproduced below for ready reference and convenience:

“A. To issue appropriate writs, orders or directions, especially issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus for staying the operation of order dated 17.04.2025 passed in OA 3559 of 2017 in case titled as 'Canara Bank vs Baba Bhagwant Singh' passed by Debts Recovery Tribunal-I, Chandigarh (Annexure P-17) as a temporary measure till the quorum of the Debts Recovery Appellate Tribunal, New Delhi is constituted to decide the Appeal No. 136 of 2025 in case titled as 'Baba Bhagwant Singh Vs Canara Bank' (Annexure P-19) and the application filed by the petitioner for exemption from pre-deposit (Annexure P-18/A) and application for transfer of amount (Annexure P-18/B) filed in which are being adjourned on account of non-availability of quorum whereas the execution of OA is pending in RC 460 of 2025 (Annexure P-20) which are being executed in illegal and arbitrary manner.

B. To issue of any other writ, order or direction, which. this Hon'ble court may deem fit and proper in view of the facts and circumstances of the case.

C. Exempt the petitioners from filing of certified copies of annexure, in the interest of justice;



CWP-27562-2025

2

D. The records may kindly be called for from the Respondent Department.

E. Requirement of filing certified copies of Annexure(s) may be exempted and permission may kindly be given for filing the photo-state of annexure(s).

F. Costs of the petition be also awarded in favour of the petitioner.”

2. The predicament faced by the petitioner-borrower is that despite filing an Appeal bearing No.136 of 2025 before the DRAT, Delhi (which is non-functional, but the additional charge of DRAT, Delhi has been given to DRAT, Kolkata), the prayer for interim directions made in the aforesaid appeal is not being considered.

3. It is not disputed at the Bar that the additional charge of DRAT, Delhi is being handled presently by DRAT, Kolkata.

4. This petition is therefore disposed of, without commenting upon the merits of the case, with request to the DRAT, Kolkata to decide the question of interim prayer made by the petitioner-borrower in Appeal bearing No.136 of 2025 as expeditiously as possible, by preponing the said appeal, preferably before the interim relief sought becomes infructuous.

**(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE**

16.09.2025

mohit goyal

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No
Whether reportable : Yes / No