

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 4222 OF 2026**

Capri Global Capital Ltd.,
Through its authorized officer Mr. Suneet Patil ... Petitioner
vs.
Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pune and others ... Respondents

Mr. Nilesh Mandavkar, i/b. Ms. Anjana Kamal Mishra for petitioner.

Mr. N. C. Walimbe, Addl. GP a/w. Mr. R. S. Pawar, AGP for respondent
Nos.2 and 3– State.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ**

DATE : 16th APRIL, 2026

P.C. :

. By order dated 06.04.2026, this Court had issued specific directions to respondent No.3 to assist the Court Commissioner in taking physical possession of the secured asset on 09.04.2026.

2. The respondent authorities provided the necessary assistance and physical possession of the property was taken by the petitioner (secured creditor) on 09.04.2026. Insofar as the order of this Court is concerned, the same is complied with.

3. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on 09.04.2026, in an interim application filed by the original borrowers in a pending securitisation application, certain directions were issued to the petitioner for handing over possession of the secured asset back to the original borrowers on 09.04.2026 itself, wherein the borrowers would continue in possession as agents of the

petitioner till 25.05.2026, by which time the borrowers would settle the loan account.

4. In this backdrop, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this Court may consider keeping this writ petition pending, to be listed after 25.05.2026.

5. We are of the opinion that insofar as the directions issued by this Court are concerned, physical possession of the secured asset was made over to the petitioner on 09.04.2026, in terms of the order passed by this Court.

6. The petitioner – bank is now before the Debts Recovery Tribunal, Pune in the aforementioned proceedings and it has chosen to accept the borrowers to be put back in possession of the secured asset as its agents. These are subsequent events that have nothing to do with the prayers made in this petition.

7. Hence, by recording compliance of our order, the writ petition is disposed of.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)