

[PRINT / DOWNLOAD PDF](#)

Sarfaesi S. 17 - 17 - DRT dismissed the application under Section 17 having being filed after the prescribed 45-day limitation period mandated by Section 17(1) - On review DRT reversed its decision on the basis that a director, had passed away prior to the auction and that his legal representatives were not duly notified of the proceedings - DRAT allowed appeal holding that there was no error apparent on the face of the record - High Court in Writ jurisdiction stayed the appellate order - Held, High Court was not justified in staying the operation of the order of the DRAT which came to the conclusion that there was no error apparent on the face of record for the DRT to invoke the review jurisdiction and recall its order dismissing the application under Section 17 .

... SUBSCRIBE TO CONTINUE READING ..... !!!! SPECIAL LIMITED TIME OFFER !!!!

Subscribe Punjab Law Reporter @ Rs 2800/- and get PLRonline.IN (including Supreme Court) FREE for 1 year (save Rs 600/-)

[Login](#) or [Join Now](#)

Full Text of Judgments / Headnotes / PDF is available in Premium Membership | Email [punjablawreporter@gmail.com](mailto:punjablawreporter@gmail.com) | 9463598502 | Trial membership for 7 days |

[SUBSCRIBE](#)

Tags: [Sarfaesi - Limitation](#), [Sarfaesi - review](#), [Sarfaesi S. 17](#)