



2026:CGHC:9976



2026:CGHC:9976

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 874 of 2026

- 1 - M/s A C Steels Through Its Partner Rajendra Surana R/o Middle Income Group Housing Cooperative Society, Flat No. 87, Vivekanand Nagar, Raipur, District- Raipur, Pin- 492001 (Chhattisgarh)
- 2 - Rajendra Surana S/o Late Shri Chandanmal Ji Surana Aged About 66 Years R/o Middle Income Group Housing Cooperative Society, Flat No. 87, Vivekanand Nagar, Raipur, District- Raipur, Pin- 492001 (Chhattisgarh)
- 3 - Rahul Surana S/o Shri Rajendra Surana Aged About 43 Years R/o Middle Income Group Housing Cooperative Society, Flat No. 87, Vivekanand Nagar, Raipur, District- Raipur, Pin- 492001 (Chhattisgarh)
- 4 - Santosh Devi Surana W/o Shri Rajendra Surana Aged About 66 Years R/o Middle Income Group Housing Cooperative Society, Flat No. 87, Vivekanand Nagar, Raipur, District- Raipur, Pin- 492001 (Chhattisgarh)

... Petitioners

versus

- 1 - HDFC Bank Limited Through Its Assistant Vice President Pranjil Agrawal, S/o Shri Pushkarraj Agrawal, Aged About 37 Years, Having Office At Hdfc Bank, Department For Special Operations, 4th Floor, Tower B, Peninsula Business Park, Senapati Bapat Marg, Lower Parel, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India- 400013
- 2 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- 3 - The Nayab Tehsildar Tehsil- Raipur District- Raipur, Pin- 492001 (Chhattisgarh)
- 4 - The Tehsildar Tehsil- Dharsiva District- Raipur, Pin- 492001 (Chhattisgarh)
- 5 - Maal Jamadar Tehsil- Raipur District- Raipur, Pin- 492001 (Chhattisgarh)

... Respondents

(Cause title, as taken from CIS system)



For Petitioners	:	Mr. Tanuj Patwardhan, Advocate
For Respondent No.1	:	Mr. Ritesh Sharma, Advocate
For State/Respondent Nos.2 to 5	:	Mr. Soumitra Kesharwani, Panel Lawyer

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

26/02/2026

1. Heard.
2. The present petition has been preferred by petitioners under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking following reliefs:

“10.1 A writ and/or an order in the nature of appropriate writ do issue calling the records from the respondent authorities concerned pertaining to case of the Petitioner for perusal of this Hon'ble Court, if thinks fit in the facts & circumstances of case.

10.2 A writ and/or an order in the nature of appropriate writ do issue to quash and set aside the arbitrary of the One Time rejection Petitioners' Settlement (OTS) proposal by the Respondent Bank by the impugned Order 17-02-2026 (Annexure P-4);

10.3 A writ and/or an order in the nature of appropriate writ do issue to direct the Respondent Bank to disclose/ intimate the complete terms and conditions, specify the settlement amount, payment schedule, and timeline of the One Time Settlement Scheme of the Respondent Bank, and thereafter allow the Petitioners to submit a OTS proposal/offer of in the fresh accordance with the scheme Respondent Bank which may be directed to be considered by the Respondent Bank in a fair and reasoned manner;

10.4 A writ and/or an order in the nature of appropriate writ do issue restraining the Respondent State Authorities i.e. Respondent No. 3 to 5 from taking physical possession for a further period of 60 days or reasonable period as the Hon'ble Court thinks fit so that as to grant reasonable time to the Petitioners to comply with the OTS terms of the Respondent bank after communication of the settlement structure.



10.5 Any other Writ, Order or Direction, as the Hon'ble Court deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission of this Court to withdraw the present writ petition, as the petitioners intend to file a fresh application for One Time Settlement (hereinafter referred to as “OTS”).
4. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1 -HDFC Bank submits that, if the petitioners file an application proposing a full and final OTS, specifying the amount and time period, the same shall be considered and decided by the Bank in accordance with the OTS Scheme.
5. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for both parties, at this stage, this writ petition is disposed of leaving liberty to the petitioners to file an appropriate application before respondent No.1 under the OTS Scheme, specifying the particulars as contended by learned counsel for respondent No.1.
6. Accordingly, this writ petition stands disposed of.
7. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, also stands disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge