



W.P.No.50465 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.12.2025

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

W.P.No.50465 of 2025
and
W.M.P.Nos.56498 & 56500 of 2025

1. M/s.Allwin Innovation (Borrower)
A Proprietorship Concern through its Proprietor
Mr.Manikandarajan Ganeswaran
Having address at 46-47
Saranam Ayyappan Nagar
PAP Canel Road, Kathanganni
Muthanampalayam
Nallur, Tiruppur – 641 606.
2. Mrs.Geetha Murugan (Co-Borrower)
R/o.16W Saranam Ayyappa Nagar
Muthanampalayam, Tiruppur
Tamil Nadu – 641 606.

... Petitioners

-vs-

M/s.Arka Fincap Limited
Rep. By its Authorised Officer Mr.S.Deepak Sakthivel
Registered Address : 2504, 25th Floor
One Lodha Place, S.B.Marg
Lower Parel, Mumbai – 400 013
Branch Address : RP Complex, No.11/1
Puthu Thottam Road
Palladam Main Road
Tiruppur, Tamil Nadu – 641 604.

... Respondent



W.P.No.50465 of 2025

Prayer :

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to impugned order dated 10.12.2025 made in CrI.M.P.No.6261 of 2025 on the file of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tiruppur and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tiruppur to conduct afresh enquiry affording reasonable opportunity to the petitioners herein.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Venkadeshan

ORDER

(By.S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.,)

The writ has been instituted challenging the order passed by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate at Tiruppur in CrI.M.P.No.6261 of 2025 dated 10.12.2025. The order passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act is susceptible to appeal under the SARFAESI Act. Thus, no writ would lie in respect of action initiated under SARFEASI Act in view of the legal principles settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Celir LLP Vs. Bafna Motors (Mumbai) Private Limited and others*** reported in ***(2024) 2 SCC 1***, and relevant portions are extracted hereunder.

“97.This Court has time and again, reminded the



WEB COPY



W.P.No.50465 of 2025

High Courts that they should not entertain petition under Article 226 of the Constitution if an effective remedy is available to the aggrieved person under the provisions of the SARFAESI Act. This Court in Satyawati Tondon [United Bank of India v. Satyawati Tondon, (2010) 8 SCC 110 : (2010) 3 SCC (Civ) 260] made the following observations : (SCC pp. 123 & 128, paras 43-45 & 55)

“43. Unfortunately, the High Court [Satyawati Tondon v. State of U.P., 2009 SCC OnLine All 2608] overlooked the settled law that the High Court will ordinarily not entertain a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution if an effective remedy is available to the aggrieved person and that this rule applies with greater rigour in matters involving recovery of taxes, cess, fees, other types of public money and the dues of banks and other financial institutions. In our view, while dealing with the petitions involving challenge to the action taken for recovery of the public dues, etc. the High Court must keep in mind that the legislations enacted by Parliament and State Legislatures for recovery of such dues are a code unto themselves inasmuch as they not only contain comprehensive procedure for recovery of the dues but also envisage constitution of quasijudicial bodies for redressal of the grievance of any aggrieved person. Therefore, in all such cases, the High Court must insist that before availing remedy under Article 226 of the Constitution, a person must exhaust the remedies available under the relevant statute.

44. While expressing the aforesaid view, we are conscious that the powers conferred upon the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution to issue to any person or authority, including in appropriate cases, any Government, directions, orders or writs including the five prerogative writs for the enforcement of any of the rights conferred by Part III or for any other purpose are very wide and there is no express limitation on exercise of that power but, at the same time, we cannot be oblivious of the rules of selfimposed restraint evolved by this Court, which every High Court is bound to keep in view while exercising power under Article 226 of the



WEB COPY



W.P.No.50465 of 2025

Constitution.

45. It is true that the rule of exhaustion of alternative remedy is a rule of discretion and not one of compulsion, but it is difficult to fathom any reason why the High Court should entertain a petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution and pass interim order ignoring the fact that the petitioner can avail effective alternative remedy by filing application, appeal, revision, etc. and the particular legislation contains a detailed mechanism for redressal of his grievance.

55. It is a matter of serious concern that despite repeated pronouncement of this Court, the High Courts continue to ignore the availability of statutory remedies under the DRT Act and the Sarfaesi Act and exercise jurisdiction under Article 226 for passing orders which have serious adverse impact on the right of banks and other financial institutions to recover their dues. We hope and trust that in future the High Courts will exercise their discretion in such matters with greater caution, care and circumspection.”

98. In *CIT v. Chhabil Dass Agarwal* [*CIT v. Chhabil Dass Agarwal*, (2014) 1 SCC 603], this Court in para 15 made the following observations : (SCC p. 611, para 15)

“15. Thus, while it can be said that this Court has recognised some exceptions to the rule of alternative remedy i.e. where the statutory authority has not acted in accordance with the provisions of the enactment in question, or in defiance of the fundamental principles of judicial procedure, or has resorted to invoke the provisions which are repealed, or when an order has been passed in total violation of the principles of natural justice, the proposition laid down in *Thansingh Nathmal* case [*Thansingh Nathmal v. Supdt. of Taxes*, 1964 SCC OnLine SC 13], *Titaghur Paper Mills* case [*Titaghur Paper Mills Co. Ltd. v. State of Orissa*, (1983) 2 SCC 433 : 1983 SCC (Tax) 131] and other similar judgments that the High Court will not entertain a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution if an effective alternative remedy is available to the aggrieved person or the



WEB COPY



W.P.No.50465 of 2025

statute under which the action complained of has been taken itself contains a mechanism for redressal of grievance still holds the field. Therefore, when a statutory forum is created by law for redressal of grievances, a writ petition should not be entertained ignoring the statutory dispensation.”

110. We summarise our final conclusion as under:

110.1. The High Court was not justified in exercising its writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution more particularly when the borrowers had already availed the alternative remedy available to them under Section 17 of the SARFAESI Act.”

Granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the Debts Recovery Tribunal within a period of one week from today, the present writ petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(S.M.S,J.,) (P.D.B,J.,)
26.12.2025**

Index: Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No

mk / ms



WEB COPY



W.P.No.50465 of 2025

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
AND
P.DHANABAL, J.

mk/ms

W.P.No.50465 of 2025

26.12.2025
(2/2)