

DEBT RECOVERY TRIBUNAL –II, AHMEDABAD

20.11.2024

Present

DESCRIPTION OF THE ORDER	
	HDFC BANK Vs. MRS. UMayya MOOCHIKKADAN
Mr.Ketan K.Parmar, Id. Proxy Counsel for Applicant Bank. Today this matter has been placed before me. Heard and perused. Applicant's Counsel submitted that summons may be issued to Defendants. The Applicant Bank is directed to take steps for service of notices/summons upon the Defendants through RPAD / Speed Post and dasti. Registry is directed to issue summons/notices on the said Original Application under section 19(4) of the Act, 1993 as per Form IV of the Debts Recovery Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1993 upon the Defendants to be served by RPAD & Speed Post and also through Dasti summons. On perusal of the file, at the time of hearing on admission, reveals that the above <i>OA has been filed before this Tribunal on 17.04.2023</i>, wherein the Scrutiny Asst. has raised objections and thereafter Section Officer has remarked dated 30.10.2024. Further that, Asst. registrar has remarked on 14.11.2024. Ld.Registrar has also remarked that <i>objections have been removed by Applicant Bank on 16.11.2024</i> and file is complete. But, this matter has been placed before me on today i.e. 20.11.2024. In view of the above, Id. Registrar is directed to explain as to under what circumstances the above matter has been put up before this Tribunal more than 19 months of its institution i.e. 17.04.2023 and why such an inordinate delay has been caused in the scrutiny and submit his explanation within 07 days. Case is adjourned to 31.01.2025 before Id. Registrar for appearance on behalf of the Defendant(s) and for filing written statement. (ANIL KUMAR GUPTA) PRESIDING OFFICER, I/c. DRT-II, AHMEDABAD 20.11.2024	