

Received on	30	05	2026
Registered on	30	05	2026
Decided on	06	06	2026
Duration	07	0	00
	D	M	Y

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL CHIEF JUDICIAL
MAGISTRATE, MANGROL, DISTRICT SURAT.**



CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION NO. 163 OF 2026

EXHIBIT:-4

APPLICANT: TATA CAPITAL HOUSING FINANCE LTD.

Having its Surat Branch Office at: 208 to 213,
2nd Floor, Eco Futurz, Near Khatu Shyamji
Temple, New City Light Road, Surat-395007

V E R S U S

OPPONENTS:

1. Babu Dige

Add: B-111, Sangam Township, Opp Sagar Society
Pal Road, Surat, Gujarat-394510.

Also at: Plot No 32, Shivdhara Residency, B/H
Divine Residency Opp. Divine School, Nr.
Abhishek Park, Utiyadra Road, Tarsadi Mangrol,
Surat, Gujarat-394120.

2. Nilam Dige

Add: B-111, Sangam Township, Opp Sagar Society
Pal Road, Surat, Gujarat-394510.

Also at: Plot No 32, Shivdhara Residency, B/H
Divine Residency Opp. Divine School, Nr.
Abhishek Park, Utiyadra Road, Tarsadi Mangrol,
Surat, Gujarat-394120.

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

APPEARANCE:

=====

➤ Ld. Advocate Mehul M. Bhatt

=====

-::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) 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.

2. Initially, on perusal and verification of the documentary evidence produced by the applicant, by order dated 30th May, 2026, the applicant was directed to deposit a lump-sum amount of RS.15,000/- (Rs. Fifteen Thousand Only) towards the expense and remuneration of Court Commissioner within ten days from the date of the order without fail and accordingly, the applicant has deposited the amount of Rs. 15,000/- as directed on 03th June, 2026 and, therefore, in view of the said order dated 30th May, 2026, the present application is listed before the court for passing Final Order of appointment of the Court Commissioner to act under the provisions of Section 14(1-A) of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002.

3. The concise statement of the applicant's case is that the application 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.

EVIDENCE OF APPLICANT

4. 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.

DOCUMENT

No	Annexure	Particulars	Page No.
1	A	A Copy of Notification.	18/12/2015
2	B	A Copy of Board Resolution	27/07/2022
3	C	Copies Of Loan Documents Like Sanction Letter.	18/06/2018
4	D	A Copy of Loan Agreement	18/06/2018
5	E	A Copy of Account statement and foreclosure statement of the borrower	26/05/2026
6	F	A Copy of The Demand Notice Under Section 13(2) of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 and Its Compliance and RPAD Receipt and Paper Publication Two Daily News	06/02/2026

		Paper Gujarati and English	
7	G	A Copy of The Symbolic Possession Notice Under Section 13(4) of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 and 13(4) Notice, Pasting Photos, and Paper Publication Two Daily News Paper Gujarati and English	12/05/2026
8	H	A Copy of Sale Deed No. 5098/2018	21/07/2018

Submission on behalf of the applicant.

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

6. 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 ?

7. My finding for the above issues are as under:-

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

8. 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. v. Noble Kumar reported in (2013) 9 SCC 620, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under:

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 other 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."] and also sub-section (1-A) "14. (1-A) The District Magistrate or the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate may authorise any officer subordinate to him-(i) to take possession of such assets and documents relating thereto; and(ii) to forward such assets and documents to the secured creditor. (2) For the purpose of securing compliance with the provisions of sub-section (1), the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or

the District Magistrate 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. (3) No act of the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or the District Magistrate any officer authorised by the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or District Magistrate done in pursuance of this section shall be called in question in any court or before any authority."] by Act 1 of 2013.

25. The satisfaction of the Magistrate contemplated under the second proviso to Section 14(1) necessarily requires the Magistrate to examine the factual correctness of the assertions made in such an affidavit but not the legal niceties of the transaction. It is only after recording of his satisfaction the Magistrate can pass appropriate orders regarding taking of possession of the secured asset.

9 In case of IDBI Bank Ltd through Authorized Signatory Vs. District Magistrate reported in 2011 SCC OnLine Guj 1280, our Hon'ble Gujarat High Court has 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.

10. 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 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.

11. In case of CA. Manisha Mehta and ors. vs. The Board of Directors of Represented by its Managing Director of ICICI Bank and ors reported in AIR ONLINE

2023 BOM 1846, Hon'ble Bombay High Court has held as under;

7. Pertinently, section 14 of the SARFAESI Act was amended twice, once in 2013 and then again in 2016. If it were the intention of the legislature to extend opportunity of hearing to a borrower before the District Magistrate/Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, as the case may be, it was free to do so. Advisedly, the legislature did not do so, for, it would have militated against the scheme of the SARFAESI Act and more 5902.wpl.8418-22 particularly section 13 thereof. It is implicit in the scheme of the SARFAESI Act that natural justice, only to a limited extent, is available and not beyond what is expressly provided. There seems to be little merit in the

argument advanced by Mr. Nedumpara and we hold that the language of section 14 is too clear and unambiguous, and does not admit of any requirement of complying with natural justice by putting the borrower on notice while an application thereunder is under consideration.

12. 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 SARFAEST Act."

13. 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, 1. Mr. Hitesh Ramanlal Shukla Bench Clerk Gr-2 to Court Commissioner under Section-14(1-A) of the Secularization 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 the rights piece and parcel of the immovable property bearing Plot No. 32 admeasuring 40.13 Sq. mt along with share in undivided unsold land admeasuring 13.24 Sq. mt located on non-agricultural land meant for residential purpose known as "SHIVDHARA RESIDENCY" situated at Block nos. 302, 304, 305 of Mouje village: Tarsadi, Sub District; Mangrol, District: Surat, Gujarat.

bounded as under.

East : By Plot no. 91,

West : By Society Road,

North : By Plot no. 33,

South : By Plot no. 31."

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.

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.

4. 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.

5. The Applicant Finance Company shall complete the necessary formalities for seeking police protection and also bear the expenses thereof.

6. 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.

7. 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. The Court Commissioner is directed to complete the said procedure within 60 days or within the time limit extended by

the court and submit the compliance report of completion of proceedings.

8. After submitting the compliance report as directed above by the appointed Court Commissioner, he is entitled to get the remuneration of Rs. 15,000/- (Rs. Fifteen Thousand) deposited by the applicant Finance Company towards the expenses and remuneration of Court Commissioner in the present application.

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

Pronounced in the Open Court on this 06th day of June, 2026.

Dated: 06th June, 2026

(J.S.Parmar)
Additional Chief Judicial
Magistrate, Mangrol,
District Surat
Judge Code: GJ01155