

**IN THE DEBTS RECOVERY APPELLATE TRIBUNAL AT KOLKATA**

(Dy. No. 56 of 2019)  
(Arising out of S.A. No. 61 of 2013 in DRT –Visakhapatnam)

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SRIVASTAVA  
CHAIRPERSON**

1. Central Bank of India, Gandhigram Branch, Visakhapatnam

...Appellants

-Versus-

1. Syed Ahmed Basha, Door No. 24-1895, Flat G.F.-A, Vybhav Apartment, Magunta Layout, Nellore
2. Smt. Pilla Yeedi, W/O Yeedi Suresh Kumar, Door No. 5-136, Chandrapalem, Madhurawada Visakhapatnam
3. Sri Yeedi Suresh Kumar S/o Thoteswara Rao, Door No. 5-136, Chandrapalem Madhurawada Visakhapatnam

... Respondent

Counsel for the Appellants

Mr.Biswajit Bhattacharya,  
Learned Counsel for the  
Appellant.

Counsel for Respondent

None for the Respondent

**JUDGMENT : On 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2023**

**THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL :**

Instant I.A. No. 384 of 2019 application under Section 5 of Limitation Act for condonation of delay in preferring the Appeal. Respondents are served but not present.

I have heard the Learned Counsel for the Appellant and perused the Record. Impugned order was passed by the Ld. DRT Visakhapatnam on 5<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 in S.A. No. 61 of 2013.

Feeling aggrieved Appeal was preferred on 14.03.2019 with an application for condonation of delay of 434 days. As would appear from the Application grounds for condonation are stated in Para No. 4 to 9 wherein it is submitted that the impugned order came to the knowledge of the Appellant on 14.04.2018 when the copy was dispatched by the Ld Tribunal on 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2018. Thereafter, the concerned branch communicated the order to the regional office on 23<sup>rd</sup> April, 2018. Opinion of the Learned Counsel was obtained which was received on 7<sup>th</sup> June, 2018. Thereafter it was communicated to the Learned Counsel who prepared the memo of appeal on 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2018. Learned Counsel sought certain clarifications and documents which were provided on 25<sup>th</sup> June, 2018 and received in the office of the Learned Counsel on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2018. Learned Counsel prepared the memo of Appeal on 7<sup>th</sup> August, 2018 and sent the same to the Branch of the Bank who sought the approval from the controlling authority which were approved on 9<sup>th</sup> November, 2018. Certain legal points were to be incorporated on 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2019. Learned Counsel returned the memo for final approval which was approved on 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2019. Paper was sent to the Branch on 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2019 for signatures which was received in the

office of the Learned Counsel on 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2019. Thereafter, Appeal was filed.

Learned Counsel for the Appellant submits that the delay in filing the Appeal is procedural wherein certain approvals were required. On receipt of the approval, appeal was filed. It was not an intentional delay. It is further submitted that the impugned judgment is passed against the law. Accordingly, the delay in preferring the Appeal may be condoned.

It is settled legal proposition that provisions of Section 5 of Limitation Act are equally applicable to the Government or Government functionary or the Financial Institution or Bank on one hand and the private litigant on the other hand. There is no distinction or special privilege is granted to the Bank in the matter for condonation of delay. Banks are supposed to act in accordance with law. Rather, they owe a higher responsibility in comparison to an ordinary litigant. Bank's officers are expected to act diligently. They have to abide by the law. Delay of each day has to be explained by the Appellant to the satisfaction of the Court.

In the case at hand, bare perusal will show the slackness and negligent attitude of the concerned officers of the Bank in dealing with the matter. Although the first ground that the judgment dated 5<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 was received by the Tribunal on 14.04. 2018 and the Bank came to know about the judgement on 14<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 could not be accepted. When the judgement was passed, due notice

was given to the parties for delivery of judgment. However, even if the submissions are accepted, then since then the record shows that at every stage there was sign of negligence on the part of Bank officers in dealing with the matter.

Even ultimately on 7<sup>th</sup> August, 2018 when the Learned Counsel submitted the draft memo of Appeal, same was approved on 9<sup>th</sup> November, 2018. Again, when the paper was sent for signatures in the branch on 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2019, the signatures were made on 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2019. It was simply a ministerial act wherein on an approved memo of Appeal Authorised officer or the competent officers had to sign. It also took more than month's time for signatures. This shows how careless and negligent the concerned officer was? Appellant Bank cannot take advantage of the negligence of its officers. It could not be sufficient cause for condonation of delay. Accordingly, I am of the view that no sufficient cause could be shown by the Bank for condonation of delay in preferring the Appeal.

Accordingly, Application No. 384 of 2019 under Section 5 of Limitation Act for condonation of delay lacks merit and is dismissed.

Consequently, Appeal is also dismissed being time barred.

File be consigned to Record Room.

Copy of the order be supplied to Appellant and the Respondents and a copy be also forwarded to the concerned DRT.

Copy of the Judgment/ Final Order be uploaded in the Tribunal's Website.

Order signed and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2023.

(Anil Kumar Srivastava,J)  
Chairperson

Dated: 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2023  
tp