

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 28849/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 12-08-2026 in RP No. 709/2004 passed by the DEBT RECOVERY TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI]

RAJIV KISHOR MEHTA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

HDFC BANK LTD. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 245333/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 245330/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 246004/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Date : 18-08-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASANNA B. VARALE

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Dhruv Mehta, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Shoeb Alam, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. Rishi Agrawala, Adv.
Mr. Ankur Saigal, Adv.
Ms. Anushree Kapooria, Adv.
Mr. Naman Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Dikshat Mehra, Adv.
Ms. Minal Chandnani, Adv.
Mr. Monish Bhatia, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Jagiasi, Adv.
Ms. Nishi Sangtani, Adv.
Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Zoen Cutlerywala, Adv.
Mr. Hasan Murtaza, Adv.
Mr. Vikram Kamath, Adv.
Mr. Sameer Sharma, Adv.

M/S. Tas Law, AOR

Upon hearing the counsel, the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. We have heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned counsel appearing for the respondents.
2. It is the say of the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner that the mentioning made before the High Court for urgent circulation of the Writ Petition was declined on the premise that the petitioner has got an alternative remedy.
3. In our considered view, the High Court ought to have taken up the subject Writ Petition and thereafter, passed an order one way or the other, deciding the issues including the issue of availability of alternative remedy.
4. Suffice it is to state that the Writ Petition which was filed by the petitioner, could not have been declined to be heard by the High Court at mentioning stage itself.
5. In view of the above, we are inclined to dispose of the Special Leave Petition with a request to the High Court to take up the Writ Petition and thereafter, take a decision within a period of one week.
6. We also make it clear that all the issues are left open including the issue of maintainability and the

alternative remedy.

7. In the meantime, *status quo* existing as on today shall be maintained by the parties.

8. Accordingly, the Special Leave Petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SHUBHAM SONI)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR