



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 29<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 13470 OF 2026 (GM-RES)**

**BETWEEN:**

MR. BABU REDDY N  
S/O NARAYANA REDDY  
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS  
R/O NO.5, SADASHIVA NAGAR  
ANEKAL ROAD, ATTIBELE  
BANGALORE - 562 107.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. HARISH KUMAR M.S, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

THE AUTHORISED OFFICER  
LIC HOUSING FINANCE LTD.,  
O/AT NO.15/1, HAYES CENTRE,  
HAYES ROAD, BENGALURU - 560 025.

...RESPONDENT

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE  
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO-(I) TO SET ASIDE THE  
E-AUCTION NOTICE DATED 02-04-2026 ISSUED BY THE  
RESPONDENT IN NEW INDIAN EXPRESS, ENGLSIH DAILY NEWS  
PAPER, BANGALORE EDITION, VIDE ANNEXURE-L IN THE  
INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY AND ETC.,

Digitally signed  
by NAGARAJA  
B M

Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA



THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

**ORAL ORDER**

The captioned petition is filed assailing the E-auction notice dated 02.04.2026 issued by the respondent as per Annexure-L.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.  
Perused the records.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners made an earnest attempt to persuade this Court to grant an adjournment and to list the matter after the ensuing Summer Vacation, 2026. However, this Court, having bestowed its anxious consideration to the pleadings and material placed on record, is not inclined to accede to the said request. A perusal of the records unmistakably indicates that the action impugned in the present petition emanates from measures initiated by the secured creditor



under the provisions of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short, "SARFAESI Act").

4. It is trite that the scheme of the SARFAESI Act is a self-contained code, providing a structured and multi-tiered mechanism enabling secured creditors to enforce their security interest without intervention of the Court, subject to the remedies expressly provided therein.

5. In the case on hand, the material on record discloses that the secured creditor, after undergoing the rigours of compliance with the statutory requirements under the Act, has proceeded to take possession of the secured asset and has thereafter issued an e-auction sale notice dated 02.04.2026. At this advanced stage of recovery proceedings, when the secured creditor has traversed the entire statutory route, this Court, in exercise of its supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the



Constitution of India, would be loath to interdict the process.

6. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the petitioners seek to question the legality or propriety of the auction proceedings dated 02.04.2026, such a challenge cannot be entertained in the present writ proceedings, particularly when efficacious alternative remedies are available under the statute. The jurisdiction under Article 227 is not intended to circumvent statutory remedies nor to stall recovery proceedings initiated by financial institutions in accordance with law.

7. This Court also cannot lose sight of the magnitude of the liability involved. According to the petitioners themselves, the outstanding dues exceed ₹8.60 crores, whereas the auction notice indicates a liability of approximately ₹10 crores together with accrued interest. The petitioners, who are evidently in the position of defaulting borrowers, cannot seek equitable indulgence of



this Court to thwart or delay the recovery process at this belated stage. Entertaining such petitions would not only defeat the legislative intent underlying the SARFAESI Act but would also seriously prejudice the rights of the secured creditor.

8. In that view of the matter, this Court is of the considered opinion that the present case does not warrant any indulgence. The writ petition, being devoid of merit and not maintainable in the facts and circumstances of the case, stands dismissed.

**Sd/-**  
**(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)**  
**JUDGE**

HDK  
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 14