



**IN THE COURT OF THE V ADDL.CHIEF METROPOLITAN
MAGISTRATE, BANGALORE CITY.**

PRESENT: SRI.VIJAYKUMAR.S. JATLA B.Sc. LL.B.,

V ACMM BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 14th DAY OF September-2023

CrL.Misc.No.3612/2023

Petitioner:

Mahila Co-operative Bank Ltd.,
No.13 & 14, South End Road,
Sheshadripuram, Bengaluru-560020.

Rep. By its Authorized Officer
Smt. Yamuna. P

(By Sri.T.K., Advocate)

- Vs -

Respondent :

1. Sri. A.C. Ramakrishnaiah,
S/o Late Chikkahonnaiah,

2. Smt. P.Lalithamma,
W/o A.C.Ramakrishnaiah,

Both are residents at
No.434, 1st C-Cross,
8th N-Main Road,
3rd Stage, 4th Block,
Basaveshwaranagara,
Bengaluru-560079.

ORDER

**Orders on petitioner U/Chapter III,
Section 14 of the Securitization and
Reconstruction of Financial Assets and
Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002.**



2. This is a petition for assistance of the Court in getting possession of the property described in the schedule to the petition. It is the contention of the petitioner that, petitioner got claim in respect of the schedule property and that respondents are obstructing to give the possession of the same and that it has invoked the provisions of SARFAESI Act, in relating to the said property and that, if the assistance of the Court is not done, it may not be in a position to take the possession of the same and hence, the petition.

3. The Petitioner got issued Notice U/Sec. 13(2) of the said Act to the obliger. The said notice was sent through RPAD and same is received by the obliger. In addition to this, petitioner got published the demand notice in two leading news papers. As the respondents have sufficient notice regarding the steps being initiated, in view of the Division Bench Ruling of our own Hon'ble High Court reported in ILR 2007 KAR 16, in the absence of any provision in the Act or rules framed thereunder requiring such notice, the Magistrate is not required to issue any notice to the borrower before passing an order U/Sec. 14 of the Act.



4. Heard advocate for petitioner. Perused the entire materials on record and the original documents. The original documents produced by the petitioner prima-facie proves the contention of the petitioner. They also proved that the petitioner has complied with the mandatory provisions of the Act. It is well-established principles of law that there is no necessity of notice to the respondent before passing any order under the provisions of the Act.

5. Hence, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

Petition is allowed with following terms:

1. Petitioner is entitled to take possession of the schedule property towards satisfaction of the creditors due.

2. Advocate Sri. Ramesh.M, KAR No.3676/2007, Mob-8660375391, R/at No.125, 2nd Floor, Maruthi Nagar, Chandra Layout, Bengaluru-560072 is hereby appointed as Court Commissioner to take possession of the schedule property and to handover the same to the petitioner, within 2 months from the date of this



order. Commissioner fee is tentatively fixed at Rs.10,000/-.

3. *The Police Inspector of jurisdictional police Station is hereby directed to give necessary assistance to the Court Commissioner as well as petitioner while taking possession of the schedule property.*

4. *Petitioner shall bear the legal expenses, if any.*

5. *The Court Commissioner is directed to report the same after compliance of the order.*

(Dictated to the stenographer, on computer, computerized and print out taken by her, corrected, signed by me in the open court on this 14th day of September, 2023).

(VIJAYKUMAR.S.JATLA)
V ACMM, Bengaluru.