



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3418]

FRIDAY, THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V. GOPALA KRISHNA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.4319 of 2026

Between:

1.GUNDUBOGULA SADA SIVA VENKATA SURYANARAYANA,
S/O. SATYANARAYANA, RESIDING AT 1-317, MAIN VEEDHI,
DRAKSHARAMAM, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT, ANDHRA
PRADESH.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.UNION BANK OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY ITS
AUTHORISED-OFFICER, DANAVAIPETA BRANCH, D. NO. 46-
7-17, DANAVAIPETA MAIN ROAD, RAJAHMUNDY-533103.

...RESPONDENT

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.VEDULA KASI VISWANATH

Counsel for the Respondent:

1.

The Court made the following:

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY
AND**

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. GOPALA KRISHNA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.4319 of 2026

ORDER: *(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Cheekati Manavendranath Roy)*

Heard Mr. Vedula Kasi Viswanath, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Ms. V. Dyumani, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-bank, who appeared on advance notice served on her.

2. In view of the default committed by the principal borrower in repayment of the loan amount, the respondent-bank has initiated measures under the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short, 'the SARFAESI Act') and sought to take possession of the secured asset. The petitioner is one of the guarantors of the said loan transaction.

3. As per the submissions made by the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-bank, three properties are mortgaged to the bank as security for repayment of the loan amount availed by the principal borrower. One such property belongs to the petitioner herein, who is one of the guarantors. Learned Standing Counsel submits that the bank is not proceeding to take possession of the property mortgaged by the petitioner and at present, the bank is only proceeding against the property mortgaged by another guarantor. Therefore, the petitioner is no way affected by the measures initiated by the bank to take possession of the secured asset of the other guarantor.

4. Therefore, in view of the submissions made by the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-bank, when the bank is not proceeding against the property of the petitioner to take possession of the same, he is no way aggrieved by the measures initiated by the bank. Therefore, there is no merit in the writ petition warranting interference by this Court.

5. Resultantly, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, interlocutory applications, if any pending, in this case shall stand closed.

JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

JUSTICE V. GOPALA KRISHNA RAO

Date: 13.02.2026
IBL

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. GOPALA KRISHNA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.4319 of 2026

Dt: 13.02.2026

IBL