



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

14 WRIT PETITION NO. 90 OF 2026

State Bank of India
Through Its Authorized SignatoryPetitioner

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & othersRespondents

Mr. S. R. Deshpande, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar, AGP for the State.

**CORAM : SMT VIBHA KANKANWADI
& HITEN S VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 4th MARCH, 2026.

PER COURT :

1. Learned Advocate for the Petitioner has placed on record a communication by the Petitioner to the Tahsildar and Executive Magistrate, Gangakhed, wherein it is informed to the Tahsildar that the borrower has submitted a compromise proposal and it appears that even half of the amount has also been paid. It is submitted that the said compromise proposal has been sent to the appropriate authority for approval and it is waiting for further communication from the appropriate authority.

2. The said letter is taken on record by marking as Exhibit 'X'.

3. It is further say of the Petitioner that if the borrower fails to deposit the rest of the amount, then the bank would like to proceed to take possession of the secured asset.

4. Here, the Petitioner has prayed that the Respondent/Tahsildar be directed to execute the order dated 02.11.2019 passed in Application No. 07/2019 under Section 14 of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 and to deliver physical possession of the secured asset to the authorised officer of the Petitioner. Learned AGP informs that the Tahsildar had gone to the spot on 10.02.2026 at 2.00 pm for handing over possession of the secured asset to the Petitioner. However, the authorised officer of the Petitioner was absent. Here, if after the petition was filed, there are talks regarding compromise, then the Petitioner should make up a mind as to whether to go with the compromise or with the petition. We do not want to keep the petition pending. Let there be a decision by the appropriate authority of the Petitioner on the proposal of compromise and in the event of the terms of compromise if any right arises for the Petitioner, then the Petitioner may go before the Tahsildar once again.

5. With these observations, we dispose of the writ petition.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR)
JUDGE

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI)
JUDGE

dyb