



Received on	02	06	2026
Registered on	02	06	2026
Decided on	15	06	2026
	13	00	00
Duration	D	M	Y

**IN THE COURT OF ADDL. CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
KATHOR, DISTRICT SURAT**

**CRMA NO.908 OF 2026
EXH. ::**

PLAINTIFF ::

IDFC First Bank Ltd. Having its Branch office at: Mezzanine Floor, International Business Centre, Next to Mercedes Showroom, Near Big Bazar, Piplod, Dumas Road, Surat-395007. Through Its Authorised Officer: Pooja Goyel

VERSUS

DEFENDANT ::

1. Jitendra Kumar Kantilal

Add. Flat No. 108, 1st Floor, Tulip Building, B Wing, In Blossom Park, Kadodara, Palsana, Surat-394327

Also at: B-108, Blossom Park, Tulip Residency, Kadodara, Niyol, Surat-394325

Also at: Block No. 309, Plot No. 32-A, Nr. Punkaj Fashion, Bardoli Road, Kadodara, Surat-394327

2. Harsha Devi Jitendra Kumar

Add. Flat No. 108, 1st Floor, Tulip Building, B Wing, In Blossom Park, Kadodara, Palsana, Surat-394327

Also at: B-108, Blossom Park, Tulip Residency, Kadodara, Niyol, Surat-394325

APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE SECURITISATION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF FINANCIAL ASSETS ENFORCEMENT OF SECURITY INTEREST ACT, 2002 ::

APPEARANCE:

=====

Ld. Advocate: **Haresh D. Moradiya**

=====

- :: J U D G M E N T :: -

1. The present application has been filed by the applicant against the Respondents under Section 14 of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (hereinafter referred to as SARFAESI Act) for taking possession of secured asset as defined in Section 2(zc) of the SARFAESI Act mentioned in the application and forward it to the applicant. The concise statement of the applicant's case is that the applicant is secured creditor as defined in Section 2(zd) of the SARFAESI Act and the Respondents are borrowers as defined under section 2(f) of the SARFAESI Act. The applicant has been notified as financial institution for the purpose of the SARFAESI Act. It is further averred in the application that the applicant has satisfied all the requirement of Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act and the applicant's authorized officer has submitted his affidavit to that effect. Hence, the applicant Finance Company has filed the present application to take possession of the secured assets.

EVIDENCE OF APPLICANT ::

2. The applicant has submitted his affidavit along with the application as it required by the first Proviso to Section 14(1) of the

SARFAESI Act and has submitted following documents in support of his application.

:: DOCUMENTS ::

No.	Particulars	Ann. Pg. No.
1.	A copy RBI License and Copy of the Certificate of Incorporation Pursuant to Change of Name issued by Ministry of Corporate Affairs and The Registrar of Companies	A 1
2.	A copy of Board Resolution (Authority Letter of Authorize Officer) 08/09/2023	B 3
3.	Copies of Loan Documents Like Sanction Letter, Loan Agreement and etc. 17/03/2022	C 5-55
4.	Copies of Sale Deed	D 57-131
5.	A copy of the Demand Notice under section 13(2) of the SARAFESI ACT, 2002 and its compliance 27/12/2025	E 133-155
6.	A copy of the Symbolic Possession Notice under section 13(4) of the SARAFESI ACT, 2002 and its compliance. 04/04/2026	F 157-167
7.	Copies of Statement of Account/Foreclosure. 26/05/2026	G 169-171

Submission on behalf of the applicant ::

3. The learned advocate appearing for the applicant has argued as per the averments made in the present application.

4. The following issues are framed for determination of the present case.

:: ISSUES ::

- | Sr. No. | Points for Determination |
|---------|--|
| 1. | Whether the applicant is entitled to the relief claimed in the present application ? |
| 2. | What Order ? |
| 5. | My finding for the above issues are as under. |

- | Sr. No. | Finding |
|---------|---------------------|
| 1. | In Affirmative |
| 2. | As per Final Order. |

:: REASONS ::

6. Before determination of this case, it would be necessary to refer some of the pronouncements governing the determination of an application filed under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002. In case of **Standard chartered Bank v. Noble Kumar** reported in (2013) 9 SCC 620, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under :

21. Under the scheme of Section 14, a secured creditor who desires to seek the assistance of the State's power coercive for obtaining possession of the secured asset is required to make a request in writing to the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or District Magistrate within whose jurisdiction, the secured asset is located praying that the secured asset and documents relating thereto may be taken possession thereof. The language of Section 14 originally enacted purportedly obliged the Magistrate receiving a request under Section 14 to take possession of the secured asset and documents, if any,

related thereto in terms of the request received by him without any further scrutiny of the matter.

22. However, the Bombay High Court in *Trade Well v. Indian Bank* [2007 Cri LJ 2544 (Bom)] opined:

"2. CMM/DM acting under Section 14 of the NPA Act is not required to give notice either to the borrower or to the third party.

3. He has to only verify from the bank or financial institution whether notice under Section 13(2) of the NPA Act is given or not and whether the secured assets fall within his jurisdiction. There is no adjudication of any kind at this stage.

4. It is only if the above conditions are not fulfilled that the CMM/DM can refuse to pass an order under Section 14 of the NPA Act by recording that the above conditions are not fulfilled. If these two conditions are fulfilled, he cannot refuse to pass an order under Section 14." (emphasis supplied)

The said judgment was followed by the Madras High Court in *Indian Overseas Bank v. Sree Aravindh Steels Ltd.* [AIR 2009 Mad 10] Subsequently, Parliament inserted a proviso to Section 14(1) ["Provided that any application by the secured creditor shall be accompanied by an affidavit duly affirmed by the authorised officer of the secured creditor, declaring that-(i) the aggregate amount of financial assistance granted and the total claim of the bank as on the date of filing the application; (ii) the borrower has created security

interest over various properties and that the bank or financial institution is holding a valid and subsisting security interest over such properties and the claim of the bank or financial institution is within the limitation period; (iii) the borrower has created security interest over various properties giving the details of properties referred to in sub-clause (ii) above; (iv) the borrower has committed default in repayment of the financial assistance granted aggregating the specified amount; (v) consequent upon such default in repayment of the financial assistance the account of the borrower has been classified as a non-performing asset; (vi) affirming that the period of sixty days' notice as required by the provisions of sub-section(2) of Section 13, demanding payment of the defaulted financial assistance has been served on the borrower; (vii) the objection or representation in reply to the notice received from the borrower has been considered by the secured creditor and reasons for non acceptance of such objection or representation had been communicated to the borrower; (viii) the borrower has not made any repayment of the financial assistance in spite of the above notice and the authorised officer is, therefore, entitled to take possession of the secured assets under the provisions of sub-section (4) of Section 13 read with Section 14 of the principal Act; (ix) that the provisions of this Act and the rules made thereunder had been complied with: Provided further that on receipt of the affidavit from the authorised officer, the District Magistrate or the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, as the case may be, shall after satisfying the contents of the affidavit pass suitable orders for the purpose of taking possession of the secured assets: Provided also that the requirement of filing affidavit stated in the first

proviso shall not apply to proceeding pending before any District Magistrate or the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, as the case may be, on the date of commencement of this Act.]"

7. The Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat has in "**IDBI Bank Ltd- through Authorized Signatory Vs. District Magistrate**" reported at **2011 SCC OnLine Guj 1280** held as under;

5. So far as the first principal contention of the petitioner is concerned, the same merits consideration because the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate and the District Magistrate, under Section 14 of the Securitisation Act are not empowered to decide the question of legality and propriety of any of the actions taken by the secured creditor under Section 13(4), which can be assailed under Section 17 of the Securitisation Act by the aggrieved person. Under sub-section (3) of Section 14, the act of the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or District Magistrate done in pursuance of the said section cannot be called in question in any court or before any authority. From the aforesaid provisions of law, it is evident that Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or District Magistrate is bound to assist the secured creditor in taking possession of the secured assets.

6. The Authority who is called upon to act under Section 14 of the Securitisation Act can only assist, nay, is bound to assist the secured creditor in taking possession of the secured asset. As the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate and District Magistrate under Section 14 is not empowered to decide the question of legality and propriety of any of the actions taken by the secured creditor under Section 13(4), which

may be assailed under Section 17 of the Act by the aggrieved person, under sub-section (3) of Section 14 of the Securitisation Act, the act of the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or District Magistrate done in pursuance of said Section cannot be called in question in any court or before any authority. It is evident from the provisions of law that the District Magistrate while bound to assist the secured creditor in taking possession of the secured assets and to take the possession of the documents relating thereto and forward such assets and documents to the secured creditor, he is not empowered to decide the question of genuinity or propriety of such documents, including the document signed or agreed between the borrower and the secured creditor.

8. In case of **Indian Bank v. D. Visalakshi** reported in (2019) 20 SCC 47, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under;

52. Applying the principle underlying this decision, it must follow that substitution of functionaries (CMM as CJM) qua the administrative and executive or so to say nonjudicial functions discharged by them in light of the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, would not be inconsistent with Section 14 of the 2002 Act; nay, it would be a permissible approach in the matter of interpretation thereof and would further the legislative intent having regard to the subject and object of the enactment. would be a meaningful, purposive That and contextual construction of Section 14 of the 2002 Act, to include CJM as being competent to assist the secured creditor to take possession of the secured asset.

54. To sum up, we hold that CJM is equally competent to deal with the application moved by the secured creditor under Section 14 of the 2002 Act.

9. In case of **Devani Jagdishbhai Dahyabhai (Third Party) Vs. DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, SURAT** reported in LAWS (GJH)-2018-12-26, our Hon'ble Gujarat High Court has held as under :-

"27. I do not find any merit in the contention that the District Magistrate should have provided an opportunity of hearing to the writ applicant in the proceedings under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act. The Supreme Court in the case of Harshad Govardhan Sondagar (supra) and Vishal N. Kalsaria vs. Bank of India [(2016) 3 SCC 762] has not laid down the law that the borrower or any aggrieved person may also be extended an opportunity of hearing in the proceedings under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act."

10. Considering the material produced By the applicant and perusing the affidavit submitted by the authorized officer of the applicant, it transpires to this court that the applicant has satisfied the requirements of Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act so as to entitle it to have assistance of this Court. The secured asset has been situated within the jurisdiction of this court. As per the pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Indian Bank (supra), the Chief Judicial Magistrate is also empowered to entertain the application filed under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act. So, in view of the aforesaid reasons

and discussion, my finding on Issue No.1 is in affirmative and so far as the Issue No.2 is concerned, I hereby pass following final order in the interest of justice;

:: FINAL ORDER ::

1. The present application is hereby ALLOWED.
2. I hereby authorize, **Mr. Shailesh Maheshbhai Patel (Assistant)** to act as Court Commissioner under Section-14(1-A) of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002.
3. Commissioner is directed Court to take possession of asset and forward such asset to the secured creditor. The description of such asset is as under:

DESCRIPTION OF MORTGAGED PROPERTY/SECURED ASSET:

"All That Piece And Parcel Of flat No. 108 Admeasuring 535 Sq. Fts., I.E. 49.70 Sq. Mtrs., Built Up Area., Admeasure 486.93 Sq. Fts., I.E. 45.24 Sq. Mtrs., Carpet Area, Alongwith Proportionate Undivided Share In Ground Land Admeasuring 22.10 Sq. Mtrs., On First Floor, (On The Higher Ground Floor As Per The Approved Plan), "B-Type Building" "Wing-B", "Tulip Building", Project Known As "Blossom Park", Developed Upon N.A Land Bearing Revenue Survey No. 111/1, After Amalgamation Block No. 98 As Per 7/12 & Revenue Survey No. 111/2, After Amalgamation Block No.99 As Per 7/12, Situated At Moje: Village

Kadodara, Sub-District & Taluka Palasana, District: Surat, State:
Gujarat, Gujarat-394327 .. Bounded As:

East: Adj. Block No. 84,

North: Adj. Block No. 100 & 101,

West: Adj. Road,

South: Adj.Road"

4. If the secured asset is found in closed condition, the Court Commissioner may take possession of this secured asset by breaking/opening the lock or may take any other steps he may think fit.

5. After taking the possession of the secured assets, Court Commissioner shall prepare the inventory of any item, Documents relating to the assets if found in secured Assets and handover the same to the applicant.

6. Copy of this Order be sent to the concerned Police Station. The Police Inspector of the concerned police station under whose Jurisdiction, the aforesaid Secured Assets is situated, shall provide necessary police Assistance/protection to the Court Commissioner on the date appointed by the Court Commissioner for taking possession of the secured assets.

7. The Applicant Bank shall complete the necessary formalities for seeking police protection and also bear the expenses thereof.

8. The Court Commissioner may take or cause to be taken such steps and use, or cause to be used such force, as may, in his opinion be necessary.

9. The Applicant shall bear the expenses incurred in taking possession of the secured assets and shall provide all necessary

assistance to the court commissioner in taking possession of the secured assets.

10. Applicant is hereby directed at present to deposit lump-sum amount of Rs. 15,000/- (Fifteen thousand only) towards the expenses and remuneration of court commissioner, within One Month from the date of Order.

11. On depositing the above said amount in the Court, the Court Commissioner is directed to complete the said procedure within 90 days or within the time limit extended by the Court and submit the compliance report of completion of proceedings.

12. The Court commissioner shall carry out the said proceedings on public holidays or except Court working hours.

Signed and Pronounced in Open Court on 15-06-2026.

Date :: 15-06-2026

Place :: Kathor

V.L. Pardeshi
Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Kathor, Dist. Surat
Code : GJ01013