



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 236 OF 2026

Anand Rajesham Mittapelli .. Petitioner  
V/S.  
Presiding Officer .. Respondent

-----  
Mr. Vivek N. Machha, for the Petitioner.

Mr. Chetan C. Agrawal, for Respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

-----  
CORAM : MANISH PITALE &  
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ.

DATE : 23RD APRIL 2026.

PC:

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. This petition is thoroughly misconceived as it prays for an order against the Presiding Officer of the Debt Recovery Tribunal (DRT-I), Mumbai (in charge of DRT-III), on the ground that the said Officer has allegedly committed contempt of the order of this Court.
3. The order of which contempt is alleged, is dated 10/03/2026, passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 48 of 2026. It is alleged that the operative portion of the order passed by this Court has not been complied with by the Presiding Officer of DRT- III, Mumbai.
4. The operative portion of the order dated 10<sup>th</sup> March 2026, passed by



this Court in Writ Petition No. 48 of 2026 reads as follows:

*“9. In view of the above, the Writ Petition is dismissed.*

*10. However, we direct the Debt Recovery Tribunal- III Mumbai (presently In-charge, DRT-1) to positively take up the interim application filed by the Petitioners yesterday i.e. 09/03/2026 in pending Securitisation Application No. 43 of 2015 for consideration of the ad interim / interim relief tomorrow (11/03/2026).*

*11. The DRT is directed to take up the application and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law tomorrow itself, considering that possession warrant is sought to be executed tomorrow by the Respondents.*

*12. The learned counsel for the Respondents, on instructions, makes a statement that till the DRT takes up the aforesaid interim application and passes any order thereon tomorrow, the notice dated 24/02/2025 will not be acted upon.*

*13. The Petitioners are at liberty to make all the submissions before the DRT, including their claim that rate of interest was wrongly modified by the Respondents.*

*14. Equally, the Respondents are entitled to refute the same.*

*15. With these observations, the Writ Petition is dismissed.*

*16. The DRT shall also make an endeavour to ensure that pleadings in the securitisation application are completed at the earliest and that the securitisation application itself is taken up and disposed of expeditiously.”*

5. At exhibit (B) are annexed orders passed by the DRT-I (in charge of DRT-III). We find that on 11/03/2026 itself, the DRT-I (in charge of DRT-III)



disposed of Interim Application No. 801 of 2026. We fail to understand as to how it can be alleged that the Presiding Officer of the DRT-I (in charge of DRT-III) can be said to have disobeyed the directions issued by this Court. In paragraph 10 of the order dated 10<sup>th</sup> March 2026, passed in Writ Petition No. 48 of 2026, this Court had simply directed the DRT to take up the aforesaid interim application of the petitioner for consideration of ad-interim/interim relief on the next date, i.e. 11/03/2026. In paragraph 11, this Court had directed the DRT to take up the application for passing the orders in accordance with law, considering the urgency in the matter.

6. We find that the DRT indeed took up the application, heard the parties and disposed of the application on 11/03/2026 itself. The aforesaid fact shows compliance with the direction issued by this Court. No case of disobedience of the order of this Court is made out.

7. The present petition is thoroughly misconceived and accordingly, it is dismissed.

**(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)**

**(MANISH PITALE, J.)**