



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WP227 No. 452 of 2026

1 - M/s Lalchandani Chemicals Through Its Proprietor Shri Sanjay Lalchandani, S/o Shri Veerdev Lal Lalchandani, R/o Shakti Basti, Ward No. 33, Indira Nagar, Dayalband, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.) - 495001

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - Canara Bank Through Its Authorised Officer/ Branch Manager, Vyapar Vihar Branch, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

2 - District Magistrate/ Collector District Bilaspur (C.G.)

3 - Tahsildar Tahsil Bodri, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

Order Sheet

15/04/2026	Shri Sachin Nidhi, Advocate for the petitioner. Shri Mayank Kumar on behalf of Shri Puranjay Bhatt, Advocate for respondent No.1. Shri Vinod Tekam, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondent No.2. Default pointed out by the Registry is overruled. Shri Mayank Kumar, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and therefore there is no need to is-
-------------------	---

	sue notice to respondent No.1. Copy of petition alongwith annexures have already been supplied to the counsel for respondent No.1 by the petitioner. Also heard on IA No.01/2026 which is an application for grant of interim relief. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is already prosecuting a Second Appeal No.987 of 2024 before the Debts Recovery Tribunal, Jabalpur (in short, DRT), however the said Tribunal is not functioning at present for want of sufficient members. In the meantime, the respondent No.3, Tehsildar, Bodri, have issued a memo on 08.04.2026 whereby a direction was issued to comply with the order passed by the District Magistrate, Bilaspur dated 06.05.2025 and Tehsildar, Bodri, has fixed the date for handing over the physical possession of the secured assets on 16.04.2026. Since DRT, Jabalpur, is not functioning, the petitioner would be remediless to challenge the memo dated 08.04.2026 (Annexure P/1), therefore, he has filed the present writ petition for interim relief. He would further submit that in the Second Appeal pending before the DRT, Jabalpur, it was specifically ordered that before execut-
--	---

ing the order dated 06.05.2025 passed by District Magistrate, Bilaspur, 15 days prior notice shall be served to the petitioner before its execution, whereas, in the present case on 08.04.2026 the notice has been issued and only a weeks time i.e. up to 16.04.2026 has been given to the petitioner. Therefore, the effect and operation of the memo dated 08.04.2026 may be stayed.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent No.1, on instruction, also submits that the DRT, Jabalpur is not functioning at present. He also does not dispute the order dated 21.05.2025 passed by the DRT, Jabalpur in Second Appeal No.987 of 2024. The issue is already pending before the DRT, Jabalpur challenging the proceeding under Section 14 of Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 and therefore the remedy lies to the petitioner is with the DRT. Therefore, no interim protection may be granted to the petitioner at this stage.

Considering the rival submissions put forth by the counsel for the parties, particularly considering the undisputed fact that DRT, Jabalpur, is not in function at present where the Second Appeal No.987 of 2024 is already

prosecuting by the petitioner, and also in view of the order dated 21.05.2025 that 15 days prior notice is required to be served upon the petitioner before executing the order dated 06.05.2025, purely as an interim measure, the effect and operation of the memo dated 08.04.2026 passed by Tehsildar, Bodri, District Bilaspur, shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.

List this case in the second week of May, 2026.

In the meantime, the respondents may file their reply.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge