

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P (C) No. 3375 of 2019

Rajeev Shukla

.....

Petitioner

Mr. B. Bahali, Advocate

Vs.

***A.O., Odisha Gramya Bank and
others***

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr. S.K. Swain, Advocate (O.P.-Bank)

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE B.R. SARANGI

MR. JUSTICE M.S.SAHOO

ORDER

28.02.2023

Order No.
09.

This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

3. The petitioner has approached this Court alleging that without issuing notice under Section 13 (2) of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002, the notices under Section 13 (4) has been issued and though the petitioner has deposited 10% of the OTS amount, but no action has been taken with regard to the OTS. Therefore, he has been grossly prejudiced by such arbitrary action of the opposite parties.

4. Mr. Swain, learned counsel for the petitioner contended that these are all disputed question of facts and if the petitioner has any grievance, instead of approaching this Court, he should have approached the appropriate forum.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after going through the record, this Court without expressing any opinion on

the merits of the case, disposes of the writ petition giving liberty to the petitioner to pursue his remedy before the appropriate forum in accordance with law, if he is so advised.

(DR. B.R. SARANGI)
JUDGE

(M.S. SAHOO)
JUDGE

Arun

