



2026:CGHC:9975



2026:CGHC:9975

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 879 of 2026

1 - Anish Juneja S/o Late Shri Gurmeet Singh Juneja Aged About 33 Years R/o Jail Road, Behind Hotel Giriraj, Fafadih, Distt. Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... **Petitioner**

versus

1 - Bank Of Baroda Through The Authorized Officer, Gandhi Nagar Branch, Lakshmi Plaza, Near Electricity Board Office, Gandhi Chowk, City-District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Collector Raipur, Distt. Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Tahsildar Raipur, Distt. Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... **Respondents**

(Cause title, as taken from CIS system)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Jitendra Pali, Advocate
For Respondent No.1	: Mr. Ankit Singhal, Adv. through V.C. with Mr. Mr. Ashish Mittal, Advocate
For State/Respondent Nos.2 & 3	: Mr. Soumitra Kesharwani, Panel Lawyer

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

26/02/2026

1. Heard.
2. The present writ petition (civil) has been preferred by petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking following reliefs:



“i. To call for the record of the case.

ii. To kindly direct Respondent Nos. 02 and 03 to maintain status quo with respect to the petitioner's residential house and not to take physical possession thereof, so as to enable the petitioner to avail the statutory remedy of appeal under Section 18 of the SARFAESI Act against the order dated 12/02/2026 passed by the learned Debt Recovery Tribunal, in light of the representation submitted by the petitioner on 17/02/2026.

iii. To kindly set aside the impugned possession order/direction dated 16/02/2026, including the proposed action for taking physical possession of the petitioner's residential house scheduled on 19/02/2026, during the pendency of the present petition.

iv. To kindly grant reasonable time to the petitioner to approach the learned Debt Recovery Appellate Tribunal (DRAT) for challenging the order dated 12/02/2026 passed by the learned DRT.

v. Any other relief, including cost of the petition, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, may also kindly be granted in favour of the petitioner”

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a One Time Settlement proposal extended by the petitioner has been accepted by respondent No. 1. Pursuant to the settlement arrived at between the petitioner and respondent No. 1, a total amount of Rs. 3,65,00,000/- (Rupees Three Crores Sixty-Five Lakhs) is to be paid by the petitioner to respondent No. 1 towards the loan amount. He further submits that, in pursuance of the said settlement, a sum of Rs. 1,00,00,000/- (Rupees One Crore) was already paid by the petitioner to respondent No. 1 yesterday, and a further sum of Rs.50,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Lakhs) is to be deposited today. The remaining amount shall be paid on or before one month from yesterday. He further submits that, since the settlement has already arrived at between the



parties, therefore, learned counsel prays that the present petition may be disposed of with a direction to respondent No.1 not to take any coercive step against the petitioner in respect of the secured assets.

4. In reply, learned counsel for respondent No.1 concedes the aforesaid facts and undertakes that, if the petitioner deposits Rs.50,00,000/- today and pays the remaining amount on or before one month from yesterday, then no coercive step shall be taken against the petitioner in respect of the secured assets.
5. In view of the statements made by learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondent No.1, at this stage, the present writ petition stands **disposed of**.
6. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, also stands disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge