SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPMS/3554/2026 Hema Devi --Petitioner **Versus** District Magistrate Udham Singh Nagar and others --Respondents **Hon'ble Siddhartha Sah, J.** Mr. Pankaj Singh Chauhan, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. Sudhir Kumar Nailwal, learned Standing Counsel for the State. 3. By means of the present petitioner, the petitioner has sought to the following reliefs:- *i. Issue a writ or order appropriate in nature to quash/set aside the impugned Recovery Certificate dated 13.01.2026 issued by the Learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal/First Additional District Judge, Udham Singh Nagar at Rudrapur in MACP Execution No.14 of 2021, "The New India Assurance Company Ltd. versus Inder Lal and others", arising out of MACP No.300 of 2010 (contained as Annexure No.1 to this writ petition).* *ii. Issue a writ, order or direction appropriate in nature to direct the Learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal/First Additional District Judge, Udham Singh Nagar at Rudrapur to determine the liability of the legal representatives of Late Inder Lal and the amount legally recoverable from his estate and grant*

			reasonable time to the petitioner to deposit such amount in suitable instalments, keeping in view her financial condition and family circumstances. *iii. Issue a writ, order or direction appropriate in nature to restrain the respondents from taking coercive recovery proceedings, including attachment, auction or dispossession in respect of the residential house occupied by the petitioner and her family, pursuant to the impugned Recovery Certificate, until reconsideration of the matter by the Learned Tribunal or such reasonable period as may be granted by this Hon'ble Court.* 4. At the outset, when a query was made by the Court to the learned counsel for the petitioner, he very fairly stated that in the execution proceedings from which the recovery certificate dated 13.01.2026 emanates, no objection has been filed by the petitioner. He would, however, submit that the execution proceedings have been initiated in the name of a dead person and that, in the garb of the recovery certificate, the revenue authorities are pressing hard for recovery pursuant to the impugned recovery certificate. 5. He would further submit that the petitioner is the widow of the original judgment debtor and that, though the petitioner is ready and willing to satisfy the decree, some time would be required for satisfying the decree and making payment against the recovery certificate. 6. Since the petitioner has not filed any objection in the main execution proceedings, the

			writ petition challenging the consequential recovery certificate would not be maintainable at this stage. However, at this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner would state that he is desirous of withdrawing the writ petition with liberty to file objections before the executing court, therein also seeking time to make payment under the decree and raising such other objections as may be available to her under the law. 7. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed with the aforesaid liberty. **(Siddhartha Sah, J.)** 21.11.2026 BS