

DEBTS RECOVERY APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, DELHI

Misc. Appeal No.46/2026

**(Arising out of order dated 17.10.2025 & 02.04.2026 passed by DRT-III, Delhi
in OA no. 2776/2019)**

Reserved on: 16.07.2026

Pronounced on: 19.08.2026

**1. Renu Arora
H.No.111, Tagore Nagar
Ludhiana**

**2. MadhuriThapar
Block No.19/608, Malerkotla House
Ludhiana**

...Appellants

V

**1. Indian Bank
through Assistant General Manager
Stressed Asset Management Branch
165, Industrial Area-A
Cheema Chowk
Ludhiana**

**2. M/s Colour Cottex Private Limited
through Director
D/6A, Industrial Area-C
Dhandari Kalan
Ludhiana**

**Also at
Rubbi Farm House
Village Talwara
Near Gaudham
Ludhiana**

**3. Rajesh Dhanda
19-A, Kitchlu Nagar
Ludhiana**

**4. Seema Dhanda
19-A, Kitchlu Nagar
Ludhiana**

**5. M/s Rajesh Hosiery Mills Private Limited
through Director
Campa Cola Road
Dhandari Kalan
Ludhiana**

**6. M/s Century Knitters India Limited
through Director
Campa Cola Road
Dhandari Kalan
Ludhiana**

...Respondents

AND

Misc. Appeal No.48/2026

**(Arising out of order dated 17.10.2025 & 02.04.2026 passed by DRT-III, Delhi
in OA no. 2776/2019)**

**1. Seema Dhanda
H.No.19-A, Kitchlu Nagar
Ludhiana**

**2. Renu Arora,
H.No.111, Tagore Nagar
Ludhiana**

**3. Madhuri Thapar,
Block No.19/608, Malerkotla House
Ludhiana**

...Appellants

V

**1. Indian Bank
through Assistant General Manager
Stressed Asset Management Branch
165, Industrial Area-A
Cheema Chowk
Ludhiana**

**2. M/s Colour Cottex Private Limited
through Directors
536/21, D/6A, Industrial Area-C
Dhandari Kalan
Ludhiana**

**Also at
Rubbi Farm House
Village Talwara
Near Gaudham
Ludhiana**

**3. Rajesh Dhanda
19-A, Kitchlu Nagar
Ludhiana**

**4. M/s Rajesh Hosiery Mills Pvt. Limited
through Director
Campa Cola Road
Dhandari Kalan
Ludhiana**

**5. M/s Century Knitters India Limited
through Director
Campa Cola Road
Dhandari Kalan
Ludhiana**

...Respondents

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Sudhir Kumar Jain, Chairperson

**For the Appellants : Sh. Akash Arora, Sh. Aditya Chopra &
Sh. Savar Wahi, Advocates**

ORDER

**I.A. No.639/2026 filed in Misc. Appeal No.46/2026 and I.A. No.640/2026 filed
in Misc. Appeal No.48/2026 (applications for condonation of delay)**

1. The present appeals are filed to impugn the order dated 17.10.2025 passed by DRT-III, Chandigarh. The instant applications in both appeals are filed to condone the delay of 157 days in filing the present appeals. It is stated in the applications bearing no 639/2026 and 640/2026 that DRT-III, Chandigarh vide the impugned order dated 17.10.2025 has dismissed the application I.A. No.1530/2025 filed by the appellants for placing some additional facts on record in support of I.A. bearing no.1492/2025. The appellants of both the appeals were also stated to have filed applications bearing I.A. no.1817/2025 and 1815/2025 for seeking review of the order dated 17.10.2025 which were ordered to be dismissed vide order dated 02.04.2026. DRT issued notices of the review applications bearing I.A. no.1817/2025 and 1815/2025 on 11.11.2025 and the respondent no 1/Bank filed replies thereto dated 24.11.2025 and thereafter rejoinders dated 01.12.2025 were filed. It is further stated that the present appeals are filed within the period of limitation if limitation is counted from the date 02.04.2026 and if limitation is counted from 17.10.2025, there is a delay of 157 days in filing the present appeals. The delay was never deliberate or intentional but due to the reason that the appellants had filed the applications dated 08.11.2025 for seeking review of the order dated 17.10.2025. The counsel for the appellants also argued that the present

appeals arising out of the orders dated 17.10.2025 and 02.04.2026 passed by DRT-III, Chandigarh are within limitation.

2. It is appearing from memo of appeal that the appellants have prayed to set aside the orders dated 17.10.2025 and 02.04.2026. The appellants have also prayed to allow the application bearing I.A. bearing no.1530/2025 filed for seeking permission to place on record additional facts and to implead the appellants as surviving legal heirs of Vijay Kumar i.e. the defendant no 3 in the Original Application. After considering all facts and also facts stated by the counsels for the appellants, the present applications are allowed and the delay of 157 days in filing the present appeals if counted from the order dated 17.10.2025 is hereby condoned.

Misc Appeal No.46/2026 and Misc. Appeal 48/2026

3. Misc. Appeal bearing no.46/2026 is filed by the appellants, namely, Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar and the Misc. Appeal bearing no.48/2026 is filed by Seema Dhanda who is the defendant no.4 in the Original Application besides Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar. Both the appeals are proposed to be decided by this common order as have been filed to impugn the orders dated 17.10.2025 and 02.04.2026.

4. The respondent no.1/Indian Bank filed Original Application (O.A.) bearing no.2776/2019 titled as **Indian Bank V M/s Colour Cottex Private Limited & others** which is stated to be pending before DRT-III, Chandigarh. Vijay Kumar who was the defendant no.3 in the O.A. expired on 26.04.2025 leaving behind appellants of both the appeals as surviving legal heirs. Thereafter, an application bearing I.A. No.1492/2025 was filed on behalf of the legal heirs of the deceased defendant no.3, i.e. the appellants for their impleadment in Original Application (OA). The appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar also filed another application bearing no 1530/2025 for placing some additional facts on record in support of IA bearing no 1492/2025. It was contended in the application bearing no.1530/2025 that the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar being the legal heirs of the deceased defendant no.3 Vijay Kumar were not aware about any proceedings initiated by the respondent no.1/ Indian Bank for recovery of dues from M/s Colour Cottex Private Limited wherein Vijay Kumar was impleaded in

the capacity of the guarantor. The respondent no.1 is stated to have issued sale notice dated 04.08.2025 and thereafter the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar came to know about the proceedings initiated by the respondent no.1 for recovery of the dues. The sale notice was also addressed to the appellants of both the appeals being legal heirs of the defendant no.3 Vijay Kumar. Seema Dhanda, one of the legal heirs of Vijay Kumar i.e. the defendant no 3 was already impleaded as one of the defendants i.e. the defendant no 4 in the O.A. The defendant no 4/Seema Dhanda and Vijay Kumar i.e. defendant no.3, never informed the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar about the recovery proceedings as they were living separately in their respective matrimonial homes. The appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar were not having knowledge of the proceedings prior to the issuance of the sale notice dated 04.08.2025 and said fact was required to be brought on record for just and fair decision of I.A. bearing no.1492/2025.

5. The appellants of both the appeals had earlier filed I.A. bearing no.1492/2025 under Order 22 CPC for their impleadment as legal heirs of Vijay Kumar, i.e. the defendant no.3, in O.A. It was contended that Vijay Kumar, i.e. defendant no.3 was expired on 26.04.2025 and as such the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar were never in the knowledge about the pendency of the O.A. The respondent no.1 issued sale notice dated 04.08.2025 which was also addressed to the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar and the defendant no 4/Seema Dhanda. The respondent no.1 was required to implead all the surviving legal heirs in the O.A. It was prayed that the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar be also impleaded as necessary parties being the legal heirs of late Vijay Kumar, the defendant no.3 in the O.A. It was also stated that there is no other surviving legal heirs of Vijay Kumar, the defendant no.3 except the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar and Seema Dhanda who was already impleaded as the defendant no.4.

6. The respondent no.1 in response to the I.A. bearing no.1530/2025 stated that the said application was filed by the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar to fill the lacuna which was left at the time of filing the I.A. bearing no.1492/2025. The counsel for the appellants of both the appeals also informed that I.A. bearing no.1530/2025 was filed on behalf of the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri

Thapar to place on record additional facts in support of I.A. bearing no.1492/2025. It was also prayed that the I.A. bearing no.1530/2025 be dismissed.

7. The respondent no.1 in response to I.A. bearing no.1492/2025 contended that the said application is not maintainable being barred by limitation. Order 22 Rule 2-B CPC cast a duty on legal heirs of the deceased to bring them on record and not upon the person who is *dominus litis*. Seema Dhanda who was one of the legal heirs of the defendant no 3/Vijay Kumar was already contesting the O.A.as defendant no.4 along with other defendants and as such the application bearing no.1492/2025 was dilatory tactics to delay the proceedings. Vijay Kumar being the defendant no.3 during his lifetime did not prefer to contest the O.A. and was proceeded *ex parte* vide order dated 04.02.2020. The legal heirs of the Vijay Kumar, the defendant no.3 cannot be allowed to step into the shoes of Vijay Kumar by claiming better right in caparison to that of the deceased defendant no.3. It was prayed that the application bearing no.1492/2025 be dismissed.

8. DRT-III, Chandigarh vide impugned order dated 17.10.2025 dismissed I.A. bearing no 1492/2025. DRT-III and observed that the defendant no.3 Vijay Kumar had died on 26.04.2025 and the present application bearing I.A. no.1492/2025 was filed on 16.09.2025 beyond the period of limitation and no application for condonation of delay was filed. DRT-III, Chandigarh while dismissing the application bearing I.A. 1492/2025 also relied upon Order 22 Rule 4 CPC. The relevant portion of the impugned order dated 17.10.2025 is reproduced as under:-

Admittedly, defendant No.3 Sh Vijay Kumar was died on 26.04.2025 and present IA was filed on 16.09.2025. Therefore, this application was filed beyond the limitation period prescribed for filing substitution application. No application for condonation of delay was filed and no arguments to condone the delay was advanced. As per facts mentioned in the IA, there are 03 LRs. of deceased Sgh. Vijay Kumar and one among them Smt. Seema Dhanda is already arrayed as defendant No.4 in the present OA and Smt. Seema Dhanda is real sister of rest 02 Lrs. i.e, Renu Arora and MadhuriThapar. This fact shows that all the daughters have knowledge of this present litigation. Even then Smt. Seema Dhanda (defendant No.4) has not filed the substitution application within the prescribed time limit.

As per amended provision of Rue 4 f Order 22 CPC, where within the time limited by law, no application is made under Sub Rule (1)

the suit shall not abate as against the deceased defendant and judgment be pronounced, notwithstanding the death and shall have the same force and effect as if it had been pronounced before the death took place.

It also appears that action of legal heirs namely Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar is motivated by an intent to delay the proceedings. When defendant No.3 during his lifetime chose not to contest the claim of the applicant, which is more than Rs.100 Crores and was proceeded *ex parte* vide order dated 04.02.2020 and when defendant No.3 elected not to contest the proceeding and was proceeded *ex parte*, the legal heirs of such deceased defendant, who step into his shoes cannot claim a better or higher right than the deceased defendant No.3 himself possessed.

It is very strange that one of the legal heir i.e. Ms. Seema Dhanda (defendant no.4) was contesting this OA and she had the knowledge that her Father has been expired and also he was proceeded *ex parte* vide order dated 04.02.2020 she never chosen to file any substitution application for impleadment in place of her father (defendant No.3) and now when the matter is ripe up for final disposal, this application was filed to reopen the case with the only intention to delay the disposal by hook or by crook.

In light of above facts and circumstances, this IA has no merits and liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly, IA No.1492/2025 is dismissed.

9. DRT-III, Chandigarh while dismissing the application bearing no.1530/2025 observed that no plausible reason had been shown by the appellants to show that they were not having knowledge of the proceedings in the present O.A. before the issuance of the sale notice. The application bearing I.A. no.1530/2025 was filed only to fill lacuna in the I.A. no.1492/2025. DRT-III, Chandigarh also observed that the present O.A. was filed in the year 2019 for recovery of outstanding dues of more than Rs.100 crores as on 29.07.2019. The defendants were proceeded *ex parte* vide order dated 04.02.2020. The defendants 1, 2 and 4 in the O.A. had filed I.A. bearing no.303/2023 for setting aside the *ex parte* order dated 04.02.2020 which was allowed vide order dated 20.06.2023. However, the defendants 1, 2 and 4 did not file written statement within the stipulated period. DRT-III, Chandigarh also observed that the present O.A. is high-valued case. The I.A. bearing no.1530/2025 was accordingly dismissed. The relevant portion of the impugned order dated 17.10.2025 dismissing the I.A. bearing no.1530/2025 is reproduced as under:-

No plausible fact has shown by the proposed LRs. that they have no knowledge of the proceedings of this OA before the issuance of sale notice. Ms.Seema Dhanda (defendant No.4) is also the legal heir of deceased defendant No.3 (her father). It was not argued that Ms Seema Dhanda, who is also represented by the same counsel has no knowledge regarding the pendency of the OA and death of her father (defendant No.3). In fact, this application was filed to fill the lacunas of IA No.1492/2025 after hearing of arguments on the said IA on 16.09.2025. Nothing is on record to show that there is a rivalry between the 03 sisters and they are in strange terms. Facts of the case show that the pendency of OA was well within the knowledge of all legal heirs.

This OA, which was filed in the year 2019 for recovery of Rs.105,54,34,469/- due as on 29.07.2019 was proceeded ex parte vide order dated 04.02.202 and thereafter, on 13.04.2023 IA No.274/2023 was filed on behalf of defendant Nos. 1, 2 & 4 but during the course of arguments, learned counsel for defendant Nos. 1, 2 & 4 has not pressed the said IA and again, IA No.303/2023 was filed for setting aside order dated 04.02.2020 and thereafter, learned counsel for above defendants on several dates obtained time for arguments on the said IA and the said IA was allowed on 20.6.2023 thereafter, WS by the above defendants was not filed within the stipulated period but the said WS was taken on record subject to payment of cost but copy of WS was not provided to applicant to enable applicant bank to file rejoinder, It further reveals that on 05.04.2024 it was ordered that this is a fit case for imposing heavy cost on defendants because they are creating unwarranted hurdles in the proceedings of this High Value Case and since 02.05.2024 the case was fixed for arguments but several IAs were filed and due to them the case is still pending at the stage of arguments.

Above IA was filed just to derail the final proceedings of this OA.

On the basis of all above facts and circumstances narrated above, IA No.1530/2025 is dismissed.

10. The appellants of both the appeals also filed application bearing I.A. no.1815/2025 for seeking review of the order dated 17.10.2025 passed by DRT whereby I.A. bearing no.1492/2025 for impleading the legal representatives of Vijay Kumar/ the defendant no.3 in O.A. was dismissed. I.A. bearing no.1817/2025 was also filed on behalf of the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar for seeking the review of the order dated 17.10.2025 passed by DRT-III, Chandigarh whereby I.A. bearing no.1530/2025 was dismissed. DRT-III, Chandigarh vide order dated 02.04.2026 has dismissed the applications bearing no.1815/2025 and 1817/2025 and order dated 02.04.2026 is also under challenged.

DRT-III, Chandigarh in order dated 02.04.2026 referred the decision of the Supreme Court delivered in **Lily Thomas V. Union of India & others**, (2000) 6 SCC 224 in which it was held that the power of review can be exercised only for correction of a patent error of law or fact, and also referred Rule 5-A of the Debts Recovery Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1993. DRT also observed that in the impugned order dated 17.10.2025 all the points raised in the review application had been discussed and as such preferred not to adjudicate the issues already discussed in the order dated 17.10.2025, including the issue of limitation. It was ultimately observed that the applicants of I.A. bearing no.1815/2025 and I.A. bearing no.1817/2025 could not establish on record any error apparent on the face of record or any infirmity in the order dated 17.10.2025 and accordingly, I.As bearing no.1815/2025 and 1817/2025 were dismissed.

11. The appellants being aggrieved filed the present appeals bearing no.46/2026 and 48/2026. The appellants have challenged the impugned orders dated 17.10.2025 and 02.04.2026 on various grounds as stated in the memo of appeal.

12. Sh. Akash Arora, Advocate assisted Sh. Aditya Chopra and Sh. Savar Wahi, Advocates advanced oral arguments and filed written submissions. The counsels for the appellants apart from referring the factual position and relevant facts/dates argued that the application bearing no.1492/2025 was filed within the period of limitation. Sh. Vijay Kumar, the defendant no.3 passed away on 26.04.2025 and as such the period of limitation for filing application for impleading his legal heirs was till 23.09.2025, i.e. limitation period of 150 days as per Articles 120 and 121 of the Limitation Act, 1963. I.A bearing no.1492/025 was filed within 143 days from the date of death of Vijay Kumar, i.e. the defendant no.3. It was further argued that Articles 120 and 121 of the Limitation Act would be applicable and also referred the case **Mithailal Dalsangar Singh & others V. Annabai Devram Kini & others**, AIR 2003 SC 4244. It was also argued that the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar got knowledge of the O.A. proceedings from the date of sale notice, i.e. 04.08.2025 issued under the SARFAESI Act wherein the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar were described as legal representatives of the deceased Vijay Kumar, the defendant no.3 besides the appellant Seema Dhanda who was already one of the defendants in the O.A. as defendant no.4. The order dated 17.10.2025 has cast serious prejudice to the appellants Renu

Arora and Madhuri Thapar and resulted into unnecessary multiple litigation. DRT-III, Chandigarh passed the impugned order dated 17.10.2025 based on the assumption that the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar had the knowledge of the O.A. proceedings but the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar gained knowledge only after the issuance of sale notice dated 04.08.2025. It was also argued that the respondent no.1 in sale notice dated 04.08.2025 has admitted that the appellants as legal representatives of Vijay Kumar, the defendant no.3. It was also argued that despite the dismissal of the applications bearing no.1815/2025 and 1817/2025, the present appeal is maintainable. It was prayed that the impugned orders dated 17.10.2025 and 02.04.2026 be set aside and the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar be also allowed to be impleaded as necessary parties in the O.A. The counsel for the appellants during the course of arguments also cited following judgments also:

- (i) **Narota Singh V. Sawaya Singh (deceased) by his LRs**, 1992 SCC OnLine P&H 440
- (ii) **Lal Chand & others V. Raghu Nath & others**, 2009 SCC OnLine P&H 5506
- (iii) **Parminder Kaur V. Karanjit Singh Mann**, 2014 SCC OnLine P&H 1494
- (iv) **Ram Pal (since deceased) through LRs V. Satbir Singh & others**, CR-943-2020(O&M) decided by Punjab & Haryana High Court on 01.09.2022
- (v) **Ranjit Singh & another V. State of Uttarakhand & others**, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 2932

13. It is reflecting that the respondent no.1 has filed O.A. bearing no.2776/2019 titled as **Indian Bank V M/s Colour Cottex Private Limited & others** which is stated to be pending before DRT-III, Chandigarh. O.A. is filed for the recovery of more than Rs.100 crores against the defendants on the basis of facts as detailed in O.A. The defendants in OA including the defendant no.3 Vijay Kumar were ordered to be proceeded *ex parte* vide order dated 04.02.2020. The defendants 1, 2 & 4 filed I.A. bearing no.303/2023 for setting aside the *ex parte* order against them which was allowed vide order dated 20.06.2023, but the defendants including the defendant no 3/Vijay Kumar have not filed their written statement within the stipulated period. Vijay Kumar/the defendant no.3 in the O.A. was passed away on 26.04.2025. The respondent no.1 issued sale notice dated 04.08.2025 which was also addressed to the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar and Seema Dhanda who was impleaded as the defendant no.4 in O.A. in the capacity as legal

heirs of the deceased defendant no.3/ Vijay Kumar. The appellants filed I.A. bearing no.1492/2025 under Order 22 CPC for impleading them as legal heirs of Vijay Kumar/ the defendant no.3 in the O.A. Subsequently, I.A. bearing no.1530/2025 was also filed by the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar for placing additional facts on record. I.A. bearing no.1492/2025 and I.A. 1530/2025 were dismissed vide order dated 17.10.2025. The appellants also filed I.A. bearing no.1817/2025 and I.A. bearing no.1815/2025 for seeking review of the order dated 17.10.2025. These applications were dismissed vide order dated 02.04.2026 passed by DRT-III, Chandigarh.

14. DRT while dismissing I.A. bearing no.1492/2025 being barred limitation primarily observed that one of the daughters/legal heirs of the deceased defendant no 3/Vijay Kumar namely Seema Dhanda was contesting O.A. being the defendant no.4 and the application bearing no.1492/2025 was filed only to delay the proceedings through dilatory tactics. I.A. bearing no.1530/2025 was dismissed primarily on the ground that the appellants could not show any plausible reason to exhibit that they were not having any knowledge about the proceedings of O.A. before the issuance of sale notice.

15. Order 22 CPC deals with death of the parties. Rule 1 thereof provides that death of a plaintiff or defendant shall not cause the suit to abate if the right to sue survives. Rule 2 deals with the procedure where one of several plaintiffs or defendants dies and right to sue survives. It provides that where there are more plaintiffs or defendants than one, and any of them dies and where the right to sue survives to the surviving plaintiff or plaintiffs alone or against the surviving defendant or defendants alone, then the Court shall cause an entry to the effect to be made on the record, and the suit shall proceed at the instance of the surviving plaintiff or plaintiffs, or against the surviving defendant or defendants. Rule 4 deals with the procedure in case of death of one of several defendants or of sole defendant. It provides that if one of two or more defendants dies and the right to sue does not survive against the surviving defendant or defendants alone or a sole defendant or sole surviving defendant dies and the right to sue survives, then the Court on an application made in that behalf shall cause the legal representative of the deceased defendants to be made a party and shall proceed with the suit. The

impleaded party may make any defence appropriate to his character as legal representative of the deceased defendant.

16. So far as the limitation in filing the application for impleadment of legal heir is concerned, as per Article 120 of the Limitation Act, the application for impleading legal representative of a deceased defendant shall be made within a period of 90 days from the date of death of the defendant. Thereafter, as per Article 121 an application for setting aside abatement order be filed within a period of 60 days from the date of abatement. Admittedly, the application bearing I.A. no.1492/2025 was not filed within a period of 90 days and as per the argument and written submission, it was filed within 143 days from the date of death of the defendant no.3/Vijay Kumar. The argument advanced by the counsel for the appellants that the impleadment application bearing I.A. no.1492/2025 was filed within the period of limitation is considered in proper perspective. There is no force in the argument advanced by the counsel for the appellants that the period of limitation for filing the I.A. bearing no.1492/2025 was 150 days after taking the period of limitation as provided under Articles 120 and 121 of the Limitation Act together. There was no specific order for abatement of the present O.A. in respect of the defendant no.3 by the DRT and as such the abatement cannot be construed as argued by the counsels for the appellants. In the present case, only Article 120 of the Limitation Act, 1963 is applicable.

17. Admittedly, the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar are real sisters of Seema Dhanda who was already impleaded as one of the defendants i.e. the defendant no 4 in OA. It cannot be presumed by any logic that the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar were not having knowledge about the pendency of the present O.A. as their sister Seema Dhanda who is one of the legal heir of the deceased defendant no 3 was already impleaded as the defendant no 4 in Original Application (OA). There is no force in the arguments advanced on behalf of the appellants as well as contention that prior to 04.08.2025 the appellants Renu Arora and Madhuri Thapar were not having any knowledge about the pendency of the O.A. The DRT in the impugned order dated 17.10.2025 has considered the relevant and factual position in detail. There is no reason to interfere in the orders dated 17.10.2025 and 02.04.2026 which are well-reasoned. The arguments as advanced by the counsels for the appellants and also mentioned in the written

submissions have been considered in the right perspective but they do not render any help to the case of the appellants. DRT in the order dated 02.04.2026 after considering the relevant factual and legal positions pertaining to the review has rightly observed that there was no error apparent on the face of the record and infirmity in the order dated 17.10.2025 and rightly dismissed the review application bearing no. 1492/2025. The present appeals are misconceived and cannot be entertained.

18. The present Appeals are accordingly dismissed at admission stage along with any other application if any. The present Original Application is pending since 2019 and is involving dues more than 100 crores. DRT-III, Chandigarh also observed that the applications are being filed as a dilatory tactics and also to derail the proceedings of recovery of high value case. Accordingly, DRT-III, Chandigarh is directed to conclude trial arising out of Original Application bearing no. 2776/2019 before 30th June. 2027.

19. The defendant no.2, namely, Rajesh Dhanda in O.A bearing no.2776/2019 has filed an application bearing I.A. no. 1069/2026 for intervention in Misc. Appeal no.46/2026, the perusal of which reflects that the said application is based on the facts which are not connected with the adjudication and disposal of the present appeals. The DRT-III, Chandigarh in orders dated 17.10.2025 and 02.04.2026 has also observed that the applications are being filed only to delay the trial arising out of present O.A. The appeals bearing no. 46/2026 and 48/2026 are dismissed at admission stage without issuing notice to the opposite parties, the application for intervention filed by the defendant no.2 of the O.A. cannot be entertained and is accordingly rejected.



(Dr. Justice Sudhir Kumar Jain)
Chairperson

-pk