

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.03.2016

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI
and
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. VENUGOPAL

W.P. No.9134 of 2016

Sundaram BNP Paribas Home Finance Ltd.
(formerly known as Sudaram Home Finance Limited)
represented by its Authorised Officer
N. Udayakumar
46, Whites Road
Chennai 600 014

Petitioner

vs.

1 The District Magistrate/District Collector
Office of the District Collector
Kanchipuram District
Kanchipuram 631 501

2 S. Karthikeyan

3 S. Shanthi

Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a writ of mandamus directing the first respondent to consider and pass orders on the petition dated 06.12.2014 filed under Section 14 of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 forthwith.

For petitioner सत्यमेव जयते Mr. P.V. Balasubramaniam

For R1 Mr.P.S. Sivashanmugasundaram
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

(delivered by SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.)

Mr. P.S. Sivashanmugasundaram, learned Special Government Pleader, accepts notice for the first respondent. Notice to other respondents is dispensed with at this stage, inasmuch as no order prejudicial to their interest is passed in this writ petition. Thus, with the consent of the learned counsel for the

petitioner and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the first respondent, the writ petition is taken up for final disposal, at the admission stage itself.

2 The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner had filed a petition before the first respondent on 06 December 2014 under the provisions of Section 14 of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short "the SARFAESI Act"), seeking assistance to take over possession of the secured asset in furtherance of exercise under Section 13(4) of the SARFAESI Act. However, the first respondent has not taken any step so far, when the object of the said provision is to extend assistance to secure possession of the secured asset, at the earliest.

3 The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the first respondent submits that a direction to that effect may be issued to the first respondent.

4 Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we direct the first respondent to take up the matter and decide the same in accordance with law and on its own merits as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The first respondent is also directed to verify as to whether there is any tenancy or lease in respect of the secured asset and if it is so, the same has to be considered in the light of the judgment of the Supreme Court in Harshad Govardhan Sondagar vs. International Assets Reconstruction Company Ltd. and Others¹ and Vishal N. Kalsaria vs. Bank of India and Others².

The writ petition stands disposed of with the above directions. No costs.
cad

s/d-

सत्यमेव जयते
Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To

The District Magistrate/District Collector
Office of the District Collector
Kanchipuram
Kanchipuram 631 501

1 (2014) 6 SCC 1

2 2016 (1) Scale 472

+ 1 cc to M/s.BFS Legal, Advocate, SR 16419

+ 1 cc to Govt.Pleader, High Court, Madras SR 16022

sai(co)
prk23/3

W.P. No.9134 of 2016



WEB COPY