



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 6795 OF 2026

Hari Dattatray Shinde ... Petitioner  
Versus  
Canara Bank & Anr. ... Respondents

\*\*\*\*\*

None for the Petitioner.  
None for Respondents.

\*\*\*\*\*

CORAM : MANISH PITALE AND  
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ.

DATE : 11<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2026

P.C. :

1. None for the petitioner, even on the second call.
2. A perusal of the petition shows that a challenge is raised to a demand notice issued by respondent No.1 (secured creditor) under Section 13(2) of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (Securitisation Act) and further actions taken thereunder.
3. Statutory remedy under the provisions of the Securitisation Act is available to the petitioner and therefore, there is no question of entertaining the present writ petition. The Supreme Court in the case of *Union Bank of India vs. Satyawati Tondon & Ors.*, (2010) 8 SCC 110 has specifically laid down the said position of law, which has been reiterated in a recent judgment of the



Supreme Court in the case of *CELIR LLP vs. Bafna Motors (Mumbai) Private Limited & Ors.*, (2024) 2 SCC 1.

4. In view of the above, we do not find any reason to entertain this petition and accordingly, it is dismissed.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)