

**In the court of Sh. Ashwani Kumar Sarpal, District Judge-
Commercial Court-05, Central District
Tis Hazari, Delhi**

CSL Finance Limited

vs.

Shyam Sunder Sharma & another

[OMP (I) (Comm) – 41/2020]

10-7-2020

Present:- Sh. Rajeev Sagar and Ms. Nazia Praveen advocates

Fresh petition under Section 9 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act received yesterday by assignment through online.

Today, the proceedings were conducted through video conferencing. During arguments, counsel for the petitioner stated that he will be satisfied if interim relief of injunction claimed is granted and he is not pressing relief of taking possession of the mortgaged property from respondents at this stage. It is also stated that as per terms of the loan agreement, the outstanding amount can be recovered through enforcement of mortgaged property but there is likelihood of settlement once the respondents are served.

Both the respondents who are residents of Rajasthan took loan of Rs. 5 lakhs from the petitioner company on 31-7-2018 and property bearing Patta no. 12914, Khasra no. 686/196, Talera, Distt. Bundi, Rajasthan was mortgaged with it as a security. This property is owned by respondent no. 1 who deposited title deeds of his property with the petitioner company. The loan agreement was however executed in



Keeping in view the defaults committed by the defendant in making payment of installments and apprehension of the plaintiff bank that defendant may conceal or dispose off the vehicle in question, I deem it appropriate and take it as a fit case where the receiver is to be appointed at this stage for taking possession of the vehicle in question. Accordingly, application under Order 40 Rule 1 CPC is allowed for the time being and plaintiff bank is permitted to take into possession of the vehicle bearing no **UP-14DW-0146** make **GRAND I-10/SPORTZ** from the possession of the defendant and **Sh. Kameshwar Sahu**, official of the plaintiff bank is authorized to seize the above mentioned vehicle and take its custody. He is permitted to take the help of the police if required. However, it is ordered that he shall also comply with following terms and conditions:

1. The vehicle shall be seized in between 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. only.
2. It shall not be seized when is moving on the road.
3. The receiver shall seize the vehicle personally and shall not delegate this power to anyone.
4. The defendant/occupant of the vehicle shall be permitted to remove their belongings from the vehicle in question at the time of seizure.
5. At the time of seizure of the vehicle, the signature of an independent person of the locality or nearby area or police official shall be obtained on the possession report.
6. The copy of the possession report shall be given to the defendant/occupant of the vehicle at the spot itself. The date and time of seizure of the vehicle must be clearly mentioned in the report.
7. The detailed condition of the vehicle as well as its accessories shall be noted in the possession report and photographs of the vehicle shall be also taken at the time of seizure.
8. The vehicle in question shall not be disposed off or sold without prior permission of the court and shall be kept in safe custody.
9. The receiver shall be under the control of the court and is required to file the report in the court within three days of the seizure of the vehicle.



mortgaged property through process serving agency of the local court. Petitioner is also permitted to put a notice board in the locality mentioning therein the restraint order passed against respondent no. 1. Petitioner can also distribute pamphlets in the locality or can publish this fact in the local newspaper also having circulation in the area where house of the respondent no. 1 is situated or property in question is situated. However, petitioner has to show the proof on next date that this order is complied with.

Put up this case on 5-9-2020. Reader is directed to upload this order today itself on the website of the court.



(Ashwani Kumar Sarpal)

District Judge-Commercial-5

Central District, Delhi

Dt. 10-7-2020

CS (Comm) No. 935/2020
ICICI Bank Ltd. vs Abhishek Singh & Anr.

10.07.2020

Pr : Ms. Gurmeet Kaur counsel for plaintiff.

Fresh suit for recovery was received by way of assignment through online yesterday. Today proceedings were conducted through video conferencing. Counsel for the plaintiff filed court fees of Rs.9,195/-. Reader is directed to report whether the court fees paid is correct or not.

An application under Order 40 Rule 1 CPC for appointment of the receiver is moved alongwith the suit for taking possession of the hypothecated vehicle. Counsel for the plaintiff relied upon the case law **M/s ICICI Bank vs Randhir Singh FAO 321/2018 decided on 06.08.2018 by Delhi High Court.**

It is stated that the defendants took a loan for purchase of the vehicle and they committed defaults in payment of the installments. According to the counsel, out of 48 installments, only 04 installments were paid and the last installment was paid on 31.07.2019 and thereafter no payment is made due to which the loan amount has been recalled by issuing a legal notice and as per agreement defendants are under obligation to surrender the vehicle in case of non payment but they have failed to do so. There is chance of concealment of the vehicle or its unauthorised disposal by the defendants.

Plaintiff bank has also placed on record statement of account to show the defaults committed by the defendants in payment of the installments. The vehicle number **UP-14EA-4837 make I-20/MAGNA** had been purchased by the defendants from the loan amount and lateron hypothecated to the plaintiff bank.

Counsel for the plaintiff further requested for appointment of **Sh. Piyush Gupta**, representative/official of the plaintiff bank as a receiver on the ground that for the better co-ordination and immediate and quick action, the official of the bank be appointed as receiver.



Keeping in view the defaults committed by the defendants in making payment of installments and apprehension of the plaintiff bank that defendants may conceal or dispose off the vehicle in question, I deem it appropriate and take it as a fit case where the receiver is to be appointed at this stage for taking possession of the vehicle in question. Accordingly, application under Order 40 Rule 1 CPC is allowed for the time being and plaintiff bank is permitted to take into possession of the vehicle bearing no. **UP-14EA-4837 make I-20/MAGNA** from the possession of the defendants and **Sh. Piyush Gupta**, representative/official of the plaintiff bank is authorized to seize the above mentioned vehicle and take its custody. He is permitted to take the help of the police if required. However, it is ordered that he shall also comply with following terms and conditions:

1. The vehicle shall be seized in between 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. only.
2. It shall not be seized when is moving on the road.
3. The receiver shall seize the vehicle personally and shall not delegate this power to anyone.
4. The defendant/occupant of the vehicle shall be permitted to remove their belongings from the vehicle in question at the time of seizure.
5. At the time of seizure of the vehicle, the signature of an independent person of the locality or nearby area or police official shall be obtained on the possession report.
6. The copy of the possession report shall be given to the defendant/occupant of the vehicle at the spot itself. The date and time of seizure of the vehicle must be clearly mentioned in the report.
7. The detailed condition of the vehicle as well as its accessories shall be noted in the possession report and photographs of the vehicle shall be also taken at the time of seizure.
8. The vehicle in question shall not be disposed off or sold without prior permission of the court and shall be kept in safe custody.
9. The receiver shall be under the control of the court and is required to file the report in the court within three days of the seizure of the vehicle.



10. If the vehicle is not traced out or could not be seized due to any reasons then report giving reasons shall be filed in this regard on the next date of hearing.

It is also warned to the receiver that he shall be personally liable in case of violation of any of the above conditions.

Since, at the specific request of the plaintiff bank, its officer is appointed as receiver so an obligation is also put upon the plaintiff to ensure that its employee appointed by the court as receiver must comply with above terms and conditions otherwise the appointment order of the receiver shall be cancelled or shall not be extended or the seized vehicle can ordered to be returned to the defendants unconditionally without any payment.

It is also made clear to the plaintiff that this is an interim measure and the order of appointment of receiver shall remain in force only till next date of hearing unless again extended.

If the vehicle could not be seized by the next date of hearing then this interim order may not be extended further so the receiver must take the sincere efforts for tracing out and seizing of the vehicle.

Copy of this order be given to the AR/counsel for the plaintiff bank for handing over the same to the receiver.

Issue notice of the suit and application also to the defendants for next date of hearing i.e. 5-9-2020 on PF/RC through speed post, email and whatsapp address, if available as well as through dasti service by the receiver.



(Ashwani Kumar Sarpal)

District Judge – Commercial Court-05 (Central)
10.07.2020

CS (Comm) No. 936/2020
ICICI Bank Ltd. vs Surendra Kumar

10.07.2020

Pr: Ms. Gurmeet Kaur, counsel for plaintiff

Fresh suit for recovery was received by way of assignment through online yesterday. Counsel for the plaintiff filed court fees of Rs.7,270/- Reader is directed to report whether the court fees paid is correct or not. Today the proceedings were conducted through video conferencing.

An application under Order 40 Rule 1 CPC for appointment of the receiver is moved alongwith the suit for taking possession of the hypothecated vehicle. Counsel for the plaintiff relied upon the case law **M/s ICICI Bank vs Randhir Singh FAO 321/2018 decided on 06.08.2018 by Delhi High Court.**

It is stated that the defendant took a loan for purchase of the vehicle and he committed defaults in payment of the installments. According to the counsel out of 60 installments, only 11 installments were paid and the last installment was paid on 23.01.2020 and thereafter no payment is made due to which the loan amount has been recalled by issuing a legal notice and as per agreement defendant is under obligation to surrender the vehicle in case of non payment but he has failed to do so. There is chance of concealment of the vehicle or its unauthorised disposal by the defendant.

Plaintiff bank has also placed on record statement of account to show the defaults committed by the defendant in payment of the installments. The vehicle number **UP-14DW-0146 make GRAND I-10/SPORTZ** had been purchased by the defendant from the loan amount and lateron hypothecated to the plaintiff bank.

Counsel for the plaintiff further requested for appointment of **Sh. Kameshwar Sahu**, representative/official of the plaintiff bank as a receiver on the ground that for the better co-ordination and immediate and quick action, the official of the bank be appointed as receiver.



Keeping in view the defaults committed by the defendant in making payment of installments and apprehension of the plaintiff bank that defendant may conceal or dispose off the vehicle in question, I deem it appropriate and take it as a fit case where the receiver is to be appointed at this stage for taking possession of the vehicle in question. Accordingly, application under Order 40 Rule 1 CPC is allowed for the time being and plaintiff bank is permitted to take into possession of the vehicle bearing no. **UP-14DW-0146 make GRAND I-10/SPORTZ** from the possession of the defendant and **Sh. Kameshwar Sahu**, official of the plaintiff bank is authorized to seize the above mentioned vehicle and take its custody. He is permitted to take the help of the police if required. However, it is ordered that he shall also comply with following terms and conditions:

1. The vehicle shall be seized in between 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. only.
2. It shall not be seized when is moving on the road.
3. The receiver shall seize the vehicle personally and shall not delegate this power to anyone.
4. The defendant/occupant of the vehicle shall be permitted to remove their belongings from the vehicle in question at the time of seizure.
5. At the time of seizure of the vehicle, the signature of an independent person of the locality or nearby area or police official shall be obtained on the possession report.
6. The copy of the possession report shall be given to the defendant/occupant of the vehicle at the spot itself. The date and time of seizure of the vehicle must be clearly mentioned in the report.
7. The detailed condition of the vehicle as well as its accessories shall be noted in the possession report and photographs of the vehicle shall be also taken at the time of seizure.
8. The vehicle in question shall not be disposed off or sold without prior permission of the court and shall be kept in safe custody.
9. The receiver shall be under the control of the court and is required to file the report in the court within three days of the seizure of the vehicle.

A.

10. If the vehicle is not traced out or could not be seized due to any reasons then report giving reasons shall be filed in this regard on the next date of hearing

It is also warned to the receiver that he shall be personally liable in case of violation of any of the above conditions.

Since, at the specific request of the plaintiff bank, its officer is appointed as receiver so an obligation is also put upon the plaintiff to ensure that its employee appointed by the court as receiver must comply with above terms and conditions otherwise the appointment order of the receiver shall be cancelled or shall not be extended or the seized vehicle can ordered to be returned to the defendant unconditionally without any payment.

It is also made clear to the plaintiff that this is an interim measure and the order of appointment of receiver shall remain in force only till next date of hearing unless again extended.

If the vehicle could not be seized by the next date of hearing then this interim order may not be extended further so the receiver must take the sincere efforts for tracing out and seizing of the vehicle.

Copy of this order be given to the AR/counsel for the plaintiff bank for handing over the same to the receiver.

Issue notice of the suit and application also to the defendant for next date of hearing i.e. 5-9-2020 on PF/RC through speed post, email and whatsapp address, if available as well as through dasti service by the receiver.



(Ashwani Kumar Sarpal)
District Judge – Commercial Court-05 (Central)
10.07.2020