

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO.418 OF 2016**

<b>Shilpa Sud and another</b>	<b>..Petitioners</b>
<b>Versus</b>	
<b>The Presiding Officer of Debt</b>	
<b>Recovery Tribunal III, Mumbai and others</b>	<b>..Respondents</b>

**ALONGWITH  
NOTICE OF MOTION (L) NO.248 OF 2014  
IN  
WRIT PETITION (L) NO.1038 OF 2014**

<b>Shilpa Sud and another</b>	<b>..Applicants</b>
<b>Versus</b>	
<b>The Presiding Officer of Debt</b>	
<b>Recovery Tribunal III, Mumbai and others</b>	<b>..Respondents</b>

**Ms. Deepa Pohuja i/by Trevor Pereira for the Petitioners/Applicants.**

**Ms. Hena Desai i/by M/s. Singhi & Co., for the Respondent No.2.**

**Mr. Raju Shah i/by M/s. Mansukhlal Hiralal & Co., for the Respondent No.8.**

**Mr. Goldie Sud for the Respondent No.12 – in person.**

**CORAM : B. R. GAVAI &  
SANDEEP K. SHINDE, JJ.  
DATE : 31<sup>st</sup> OCTOBER, 2017**

**PC.**

**1]** The Petitioners have an alternate efficacious remedy of filing an Appeal before the learned DRAT. In that view of the matter, we are not inclined to entertain the Petition. The Petition is therefore rejected by

relegating the Petitioners to the ordinary remedy available to them in law.

2]           Needless to state that the Petitioners would be entitled to the benefit of Section 14 of the Limitation Act for the period they were prosecuting the present Petition.

[SANDEEP K. SHINDE, J]

[B. R. GAVAI, J]