



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 16.06.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
and
THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE A.D.MARIA CLETE**

W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

and

W.M.P(MD)Nos.20112, 20114, 20117 & 20119 of 2023

S.Shanmuga Perumal

... Petitioner

vs.

- 1.The Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India,
Survey No.115/1,
Financial District,
Nanakramguda,
Gachibowli,
Hyderabad – 500 032.
- 2.M/s.Housing Development Finance Corporation Limited,
Represented through its Branch Manager,
7A, West Veli Street,
Madurai – 625 001.
- 3.The Authorised Officer,
Housing Development Finance Corporation Limited,
406, Sakthi Sivan Plaza,
Pumping Station Road,
9th Cross Street, K.K. Nagar (East),
Madurai – 625 009.

1/10



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

WEB COPY

4.HDFC Ergo General Insurance Company Limited,
Represented through its Branch Manager,
242-B, 3rd Floor, Reha Towers,
Kamarajar Salai,
Madurai.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the impugned demand notice dated 12.12.2022 in Reference Suit No. 147646 and consequential possession notice dated 08.03.2023 in Reference Suit No.147646 issued by the third respondent and quash the same and consequentially forbearing the respondents 2 and 3 from pursuing any action under the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 in respect of the subject property in Plot No.101, S.No.69/2A3, Vaigai Nagar, Ayanthathaneri Village, S.Alangulam, Ward No.4 Madurai - 625 017.

For Petitioner	: Mr.T.R.Jeyapalam
For R – 1	: Mr.S.Anwar Sameem
For R – 2	: Not ready in notice
For R – 3	: Mr.N.S.Karthikeyan
For R – 4	: Mr.S.Srinivasa Raghavan



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

WEB COPY

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.)

The demand notice, dated 12.12.2022 and the possession notice dated 08.03.2023 issued by the third respondent/HDFC Bank under the SARFAESI Act are under challenge in the present Writ Petition.

2.The action initiated under the SARFAESI Act is susceptible to an appeal under the provisions of the Act. Since alternative remedy is contemplated under the SARFAESI Act, the Writ Petition under Article 226 of Constitution of India is not maintainable.

3.The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Celir LLP Vs. Bafna Motors (Mumbai) Private Limited and others*** reported in ***(2024) 2 SCC 1*** held that the High Court was not justified in exercising the writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of Constitution of India, since efficacious alternative remedy is contemplated under the provisions of the SARFAESI Act. Paragraph Nos.97, 98, 110 and 110.1 would be relevant in this context and have been extracted herein:-

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



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

WEB COPY 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 quasi-judicial bodies for redressal of the grievance of any aggrieved person. Therefore, in all such cases, the High Court must insist



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

WEB COPY

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 self-imposed restraint evolved by this Court, which every High Court is bound to keep in view while exercising power under Article 226 of the 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



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

WEB COPY

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



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

WEB COPY

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 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.”



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

WEB COPY

3.In view of the above legal position, granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the Debts Recovery Tribunal to redress his grievance, this Writ Petition stands dismissed. However, the period during which the present Writ Petition was pending before this Court shall be taken into consideration for the purpose of condoning the delay, if any. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

[S.M.S.,J.] & [A.D.M.C.,J.]
16.06.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
ps



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India,
Survey No.115/1,
Financial District,
Nanakramguda,
Gachibowli,
Hyderabad – 500 032.
- 2.M/s.Housing Development Finance Corporation Limited,
Represented through its Branch Manager,
7A, West Veli Street,
Madurai – 625 001.
- 3.The Authorised Officer,
Housing Development Finance Corporation Limited,
406, Sakthi Sivan Plaza,
Pumping Station Road,
9th Cross Street, K.K. Nagar (East),
Madurai – 625 009.
- 4.HDFC Ergo General Insurance Company Limited,
Represented through its Branch Manager,
242-B, 3rd Floor, Reha Towers,
Kamarajar Salai,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
and
DR.A.D.MARIA CLETE, J.

ps

ORDER MADE IN
W.P(MD)No.23944 of 2023

DATED : 16.06.2025

10/10