



Arb. Apln. No.730 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

Arb. Apln. No.730 of 2025

1.M/s.Srinithi Capital Private Ltd.
Rep. by its Chief Manager Mr.R.Selvam
at 2nd Floor, 2A, Mookambika Complex
No.4, Lady Desika Road, Mylapore
Chennai 600 004

2.M/s.Hinduja Leyland Finance
Rep. by its Area Manager Mr.Ashok
No.1, Sardar Patel Road, Guindy
Chennai 600 032

.. Applicants

Vs.

1.L.Naveen

2.Mayfair Trans Tech
Limited Liability Partner
No.74, Sathyadev Avenue
RA Puram, Chennai 600 028

3.M.Eshwar

.. Respondents

Arbitration Application filed under Order XIV Rule 8 of Original Side Rules, read with Section 9(ii)(b) and (e) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, to seize the schedule mentioned vehicle which is lying under the custody of the respondent or his men, agents, servants or anyone claiming under them



Arb. Apln. No.730 of 2025

from the premises of 1st respondent at 111A Gurubavan Kovil Street, Aparana Nagar, Ayapakkam, Tiruvallur 600 077 or at any other place where the scheduled asset is found, with the police aid any be breaking open locks if necessary and to take the same into his custody and sell the same at fair market price.

For applicants : Mr.K.Sendurpandi

For respondents : *ex parte*

ORDER

This application was filed for appointment of an Advocate Commissioner to seize the vehicle and hand over the same to the applicants.

2. When the matter came up for hearing on 03.07.2025, this Court passed the following order :

“As directed by this Court, the applicants have effected Substituted Service on the Respondents 1 to 3 by effecting paper publication. The paper publication has been enclosed along with the Affidavit of service. Hence, the Respondents 1 to 3 are set exparte by this Court.

2. The respondents are defaulters in repayment of the loan to the applicants. The loan agreement dated 29.07.2023 empowers the applicants to repossess the vehicle from the respondents in case the respondents commit default in repayment of the loan. As on 22.04.2025, a sum of Rs.13,29,985/- is due and payable by the respondents to the applicants, as is seen from the statement of account filed along with this application. As on the date of filing of the application, the respondents are in arrears of Rs.13,38,100/- as is seen from the affidavit filed in support of the petition.



WEB COPY

3. The applicants have expressed their difficulty to appoint the Advocate Commissioner on its own. They have also expressed their willingness to go for arbitration in accordance with arbitration clause contained in the loan agreement, dated 29.07.2023. The applicants have already recalled the loan of the respondents. This Court after giving due consideration to the contents of the affidavit filed in support of the application, is of the considered view, a prima facie case has been made out by the applicants for the appointment of an Advocate Commissioner by this Court to repossess the vehicle from the respondents or wherever available. To enable the respondents to take back possession of the vehicle from the Advocate Commissioner, they must be put on terms for getting back the vehicle from the applicants after re-possession. In order to strike a balance, the following order is passed by this Court:

a) Mr.A.Baskar, Advocate, having office at No.37/40, 3rd main road, Thiruvalluvar nagar, Kodungaiyur, Chennai 600 118 (Mob. No.7904881526) is appointed as the Advocate Commissioner to re-posses the vehicle, morefully described in the schedule to the Judges Summons from the respondents from their premises or wherever available;

b)The Advocate Commissioner, after re-possessing the vehicle, shall handover interim custody of the same to the applicants, who shall keep it in their safe custody;

c)The Advocate Commissioner, immediately after re-possessing the subject vehicle, shall intimate the respondents either through Registered Post with Acknowledgment Due (RPAD) or by hand delivery through a written communication that the arrears of installments work out to Rs.13,29,985/-;

d)The respondents, on payment of Rs.13,29,985/- to the applicants within a period of three days from the date when the subject vehicle was re-possessed, is entitled for return of the seized vehicle. On receipt of the sum of Rs.13,29,985/- within the stipulated time as stated supra, the applicants shall re-deliver the subject vehicle back to the respondents with proper acknowledgment and the advocate commissioner shall also render proper assistance for the same;

e)The applicants shall initiate arbitration in accordance with the arbitration agreement contained in the



WEB COPY



Arb. Apn. No.730 of 2025

contract within a period of 90 days from today. In case, the applicants fail to initiate arbitration within the stipulated time, the order passed by this Court today shall stand automatically vacated and the re-possessed vehicle shall also be redelivered back to the respondents by the applicants unconditionally;

f)In case, the Advocate Commissioner requires Police assistance due to any law and order problem or due to any obstruction caused by the respondents or by any third party, while re-possessing the vehicle, the advocate commissioner is at liberty to seek police assistance from the concerned police station and the police department shall grant police protection accordingly. In case, break open of the premises, where the vehicle is located, is required, the Advocate Commissioner shall break open the premises in the presence of the police and take an inventory and thereafter re-posses the vehicle;

g)The Advocate Commissioner shall be paid an initial remuneration of Rs.25,000/- and on receipt of the same, the advocate commissioner shall proceed to execute this order. All the boarding, lodging and travelling expenses for the Advocate Commissioner shall be borne by the applicants.

4. With the aforesaid directions, this application stands disposed of.

5. Post the matter for reporting compliance on 07.08.2025.”

3. Pursuant to the above order, notices taken and the respondents were served and their names have also been printed in the cause list. There is no appearance either in person or through counsel.

4. When the matter came up for hearing today, the learned counsel for the applicants submitted that the vehicle was seized today morning and it was handed over to the representative of the applicant company.



Arb. Apln. No.730 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. It is seen from the records that the trigger notice under Section 21 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (in short “the Act”), was issued on 22.04.2025 and the agreement provided for unilateral appointment of arbitrator which cannot be done by the applicant, in view of the judgment of the Apex Court in ***Central Organisation for Railway Electrification Vs. ECI SPIC SMO MCML (JV) reported in (2025) 4 SCC 641***. Hence, the applicants shall take immediate steps by filing an application under Section 11 of the Act, for appointment of an Arbitrator to resolve the dispute between the parties.

6. The purpose for which the present application was filed has been served, since the Advocate Commissioner has already seized the vehicle and handed over the same to the applicant.

In the result, this application is disposed of in the above terms. No costs.

09.09.2025

gya

N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.

gya



WEB COPY



Arb. Apln. No.730 of 2025

Arb. Apln. No.730 of 2025

09.09.2025