

February 19, 2026
Sl. No.18
Court No.1
s.biswas

FMA 881 of 2025
With
CAN 1 of 2025

Varun Roshan Kohli
vs.
State Bank of India and others

Mr. Varun Roshan Kohli
... the appellant in-person

Per, Sujoy Paul, C.J.

1. The appellant appears in-person.
2. The subject matter of challenge is the order dated 02.05.2025 passed in WPA 22557 of 2024. The said petition was filed by the Bank to seek compliance of the order passed by the District Magistrate in exercise of power under Section 14 of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (SARFAESI Act). The learned Single Judge only opined that if the amount for deployment of police personnel is quantified and informed, the

direction may be complied with subject to any interim/final order passed by appropriate Tribunal/Court.

3. The appellant on the last date of hearing also (on 15.01.2026) made wild allegation against the sitting Judges of this court and Supreme Court and therefore the matter was adjourned on 15.01.2026 by informing him that he is free to apprise us about the legality, validity and propriety of the impugned order dated 02.05.2025 but rest of the irresponsible allegations cannot be entertained. Sadly, today also he raised similar contention against the sitting Judges of this court, former Chief Justice and even against the sitting Judge of Supreme Court. We are not inclined to enter into this area which has nothing to do with the legality, validity and propriety of the impugned order dated 02.05.2025.
4. During course of hearing, the appellant himself informed that after passing of impugned order dated 02.05.2025, his

main original application filed before the Debts Recovery Tribunal has been dismissed against which he has preferred a writ petition which is pending consideration before this court. The appellant, if aggrieved, can press the pending writ petition against the order of DRT.

5. So far the impugned order dated 02.05.2025 is concerned, the learned Single Judge has not committed any error of law because when the order dated 02.05.2025 was passed, there was no interim order against the order passed by learned District Magistrate in exercise of power under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act. He had passed an order to quantify the amount and nothing more. Thus, we find no reason to interfere in this order. However, this order will not come in the way of the appellant to assail the basic order of DRT in appropriate proceeding (if not already challenged).

6. With the aforesaid observation, the appeal is dismissed. With the dismissal of the appeal, CAN 1 of 2025 also stands dismissed.

(Sujoy Paul, C.J.)

(Partha Sarathi Sen, J.)