



**103 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CM-8420-CWP-2025 in/and
CWP No.3770 of 2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03.07.2025

M/S LAXMI GRITS PVT LTD.Petitioner
Versus
AUTHORIZED OFFICER INDIAN BANKRespondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Gourave Bhayya, Advocate,
Mr. Akash Manocha, Advocate and
Mr. Vishawjeet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

* * * * *

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

CM-8420-CWP-2025

This application is for preponement of the date of hearing in the main petition.

Issue notice to the respondent.

Mr. Rajiv Joshi, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-Bank and submits that he has no objection to the preponment of the date of hearing in the main petition.

With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, this application is allowed and the date of hearing in the main petition is preponed and the matter is taken up for hearing today itself.

CWP No.3770 of 2022 (O&M)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has submitted a proposal for One Time Settlement (OTS), which is pending



consideration with the respondent-Bank. The petitioner fulfills the criteria laid down by the respondent-Bank for One Time Settlement (OTS). He further submits that this Court on 11.03.2022 while issuing notice of motion had passed the interim order preventing coercive steps against the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the respondent-Bank submits that the proposal of the petitioner for One Time Settlement (OTS) was considered by the Branch Office and it has forwarded the same to the Head Office for approval. He further submits that the final decision on the same would be taken shortly.

3. Heard.

4. This court in order dated 11.03.2022 had observed as under:-

“Notice of motion.

Mr. Rajiv Joshi, Advocate for the Caveator accepts notice on behalf respondent-Bank and seeks time to file reply to the contentions of the petitioner mentioned in the Writ Petition.

List on 27.07.2022.

Prima facie, we are of the view that the loan account of the petitioner could not have been declared as NPA on 29.02.2020, since according to the statement of loan filed by the petitioner, substantial payment of `16.10 Lakhs were received in the month of January 2020, and as per the norms fixed by the RBI, an account can be declared as NPA only if there was no payment made towards principal or interest in the preceding 90 days. It is further contended that fresh sanction letter for the loan was also issued on 05.03.2022. Therefore, there shall be no coercive action initiated against the petitioner, until further orders.”

5. In view of the above, it would be in the interest of justice if the borrower is protected for some time till the bank decides his OTS proposal.

Therefore, the respondent-Bank shall not initiate any coercive steps against



the petitioner till the final decision is taken qua the One Time Settlement (OTS).

6. The petition stands disposed of accordingly. All pending miscellaneous application(s) also stand disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

03.07.2025
sandeep

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No