



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.5781 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO.27940 OF 2025

M/s. Ray Projects Pvt. Ltd. and Anr.

...Petitioners

Versus

The Board of Directors of Canara Bank and
Ors.

...Respondents

Digitally
signed by
JITENDRA
SHANKAR
NIJASURE
Date:
2025.10.07
12:45:04
+0530

Mr. Mathews Nedumpara with Ms. Hemali Kurne and Mr. Satsang
Tailor i/b. Nedumpara and Nedumpara for the Applicant / Petitioner.

Ms. Vaishali Bhilare with Mr. Atharva Bhilare for Respondent Nos.1
to 3.

Ms. Vrushali Kabre, for Respondent No.7.

CORAM : R.I. CHAGLA AND
FARHAN P. DUBASH, JJ.

Reserved on : 25TH SEPTEMBER, 2025

Pronounced on : 07TH OCTOBER, 2025.

J U D G M E N T :-

1. By this Writ Petition, the Petitioners are seeking a
direction to the Central Government and Reserve Bank of India to
enforce the Notification (**‘MSME Notification’**) dated 29th May, 2015
and further ensure that the recovery action initiated against the

Petitioners that is stated to be in violation of the mandate of the MSME Notification is recalled. The Petitioners have accordingly sought to restrain further action being taken by the Respondent Nos.1 to 3 (**“Respondent – Bank”**) under the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short **“SARFAESI Act”**) for enforcement of its security interest.

2. Petitioner No.1 is stated to be a private limited, small manufacturing company registered as a Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise (**MSME**) Unit under the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Act, 2006 (for short **“MSMED Act”**) and is claiming entitlement to the benefits of the MSMED Act read with the MSME Notification dated 29th May, 2015. The Petitioners have relied upon the Petitioner Company’s MSME Udyog Aadhaar Registration Certificate dated 6th September, 2019 annexed at Exhibit ‘A’ to the Petition and Petitioner Company’s Udyam Registration Certificate No.UDYAM-MH-18-00331519 dated 30th December, 2020 annexed at Exhibit ‘B’ to the Petition.

3. A brief background of the relevant facts are as under:-

(i) Petitioner No.1 has been banking with the Respondent – Bank since the last 14 years.

(ii) The loan account of Petitioner No.1 had slipped into a Non Performing Asset (“NPA”) on 19th May, 2015, 14th January, 2022, 18th August, 2022, 24th January, 2024 and 20th October, 2024. On each of these dates when the loan account of Petitioner No.1 was declared as NPA, the Petitioners had either paid the outstanding installment and / or regularized it and also requested the Respondent – Bank to renew the limits.

(iii) On 28th March, 2024, the OCC / ODBD facility of Petitioner No.1 was renewed by the Respondent – Bank for Rs.176.00 lakhs. One of the sanction conditions provided for starting a recurring deposit (RD) of Rs.5.00 lacs per month. It is pertinent to note that the Petitioners failed to comply with the said condition. The validity of sanction was till 27th September, 2024. The RD was credited only once on 29th April, 2024 and hence the account of Petitioner No. 1 slipped into NPA on 20th October, 2024.

(iv) A notice dated 21st October 2024 was issued by the

Respondent – Bank under Section 13(2) of the SARFAESI Act but there was no response to the same. Interestingly, the Petition does not even disclose this demand notice but instead, refers to an earlier demand notice issued by the Respondent – Bank on 22nd August, 2022 being Exhibit – N at page 78 to the Petition, which was not proceeded with by the Respondent – Bank.

(v) A possession notice dated 8th January, 2025 was then issued by the Respondent – Bank under Section 13(4) read with Rules 8 and 9 of the Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002.

(vi) The present Writ Petition has thereafter been filed on 22nd February, 2025 without filing any Securitization Application as provided under Section 17 of the SARFAESI Act.

(vii) An Interim Application has also been preferred in the above Petition to restrain the Respondent – Bank from taking further measures pursuant to the measures taken under Section 13(2), 13(4) and 14 and in particular the e-auction sale notice dated 26th August, 2025 issued by the Respondent – Bank to auction the property on 26th September, 2025.

4. Mr. Nedumpara the learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioners has submitted that a bare perusal of the MSME Notification S.O. 1432 (E) dated 29th May, 2015, would establish that before a loan account of an MSME Borrower turns stressed, the bank or creditor is required to identify incipient stress in the account by creating three sub-categories, as laid down under the Special Mention Account (SMA) pursuant to which, the bank or the creditor is required to inform the MSME Borrower about the mechanism of availing the 'Corrective Action Plan' as may be formulated by the Composition of Committee for Stressed MSMEs. He has referred to Clause 3 of the said MSME Notification which provides a framework for the constitution of an impartial and an Expert Committee representing the interests of all stakeholders such as the Creditor, State Government as also an Independent External Expert with expertise in MSME related matters. He has further submitted that Clauses 4 and 5 of the framework provides for robust mechanism to revive and restructure the stressed account of the borrower which includes (a) Rectification (provides for additional need base financing if considered necessary), (b) Restructuring, (c) Recovery – i.e. availing the legal recourse and recovery options, if and only if, the first two options are not feasible.

5. Mr Nedumpara has submitted that in the instant case, the Respondent – Bank instead of nurturing and providing support, has literally arm-twisted the Petitioner – MSME and has brought its business to peril. Thus, the Respondent - Bank has willfully violated the MSME Notification which provides an opportunity to restructure advances extended to the MSME sector. The Respondent – Bank without providing any opportunity for rectification and restructuring, straightway proceeded with the recovery proceedings in sheer disregard to the provisions of law.

6. Mr. Nedumpara has submitted that the Petitioners' account should not be classified as NPA, except in accordance with the mechanism provided under the MSME Notification dated 29th May, 2015 issued under the MSMED Act, wherein the recovery measures can be initiated only after the mechanism for rectification and restructuring have failed. He has submitted that the Notice under Section 13(2) of the SARFAESI Act and all proceedings in furtherance thereof, including the impugned sale notice are thus rendered void *ab initio*.

7. Mr. Nedumpara has referred to Section 34 of Recovery of

Debts and Bankruptcy Act, 1993; Section 34 of the SARFAESI Act and Section 231 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) which provide a bar to the jurisdiction of the Civil Court to adjudicate the controversies which fall into the realm of the said Acts. He has submitted that a legal system need not confer such a right on a borrower for the enforcement of his rights before the DRT and the NCLT, for the doors of the Civil Court are open as a Court of record of plenary jurisdiction, empowered and competent to adjudicate any controversy of a civil nature under the sun, to any person aggrieved. He has submitted that the problem arises by virtue of the aforesaid provisions of the respective Acts by which the jurisdiction of the Civil Court is barred.

8. Mr. Nedumpara has submitted that the MSME Notification under the MSMED Act provides for the constitution of a stressed MSME Committee of all creditors that is able, adept and legally empowered to undertake the task of revival and rehabilitation of the stressed MSMEs. He has submitted that the Banks / Financial Institutions are duty bound to first put the MSME Borrower through the mechanism prescribed under the MSME Notification before the MSME Company can be admitted to insolvency resolution under the

IBC, 2016.

9. Mr. Nedumpara has accordingly submitted that the prayers in the above Petition be granted, particularly since the MSMED Act has not ousted the jurisdiction of the Civil Court providing for an alternative forum to adjudicate the inter-sé disputes between parties which are governed by the MSMED Act. As a corollary thereof, he has submitted that the DRTs created under the RDB Act, 1993 and the NCLTs created under the IBC, 2016 are invested with no jurisdiction to adjudicate a dispute arising out of / involving the provisions of the MSMED Act, 2006.

10. Mr. Nedumpara has submitted that the Respondent – Bank is not entitled to take recourse to the provisions of the SARFAESI Act for recovery of the amounts claimed to be due to it, especially since the MSMED Act, provides a mechanism whereby the Committee having corrective action plan is contemplated under the MSME Notification and which mechanism is required to be exhausted first.

11. Mr. Nedumpara has accordingly sought for direction to the Respondent – Bank to constitute a Committee for the resolution

of stress of MSMEs, as contemplated in paragraph 2 of the MSME Notification issued under MSMED Act and to resolve the stress in accordance with the MSME Notification and such other relevant Notifications / guidelines framed by the RBI.

12. Mr. Nedumpara has placed reliance upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in *M/s. Pro Knits Vs. The Board of Directors of Canara Bank and Ors.*¹ in support of his contention that the MSME Notification issued under the MSMED Act has statutory force, and is binding on all scheduled commercial banks. In this judgment, it has been held by the Supreme Court that it is mandatory or obligatory on the part of the Banks to follow the instructions / directions issued by the Central Government and the RBI with regard to the framework for revival and rehabilitation of MSMEs.

13. Mr. Nedumpara has further submitted that this judgment has been interpreted by the Madras High Court in *A.K. Karthikeyan Vs. The Authorized Officer & Anr.*². The Madras High Court has held that without exhausting the benefits granted under the MSME Notification, the attitude of the bank to proceed for sale of the

1 (2024) 8 S.C.r. 140.

2 Writ Petition (MD)23328 of 2024 uploaded on 12th June, 2025.

property is as good as killing the business units. The Madras High Court, relying upon *M/s. Pro Knits (Supra)* which held that the MSME Notification has statutory force, directed the Bank to formulate a revival and rehabilitation scheme for the unit of the Petitioner in that case under the MSME Notification and had allowed the Writ Petition by setting aside the sale notices. Thus, it was held that the Bank was not empowered to take any proceedings under the SARFAESI Act for recovery of the loan amount before referring the loan account to the Committee, as per RBI guidelines for framework for revival and rehabilitation under the MSMED Act.

14. Mr. Nedumpara has also relied upon the judgment of the High Court of Kerala in *M/s. PDMC Industries & Ors. Vs. Ministry of Micro Small and Medium Enterprises & Anr.*³, which holds that the Bank is bound to comply with the MSME Notification which mandates that before classifying an MSME Account as NPA, Banks must identify stress in the account by categorizing it as SMA – 0, SMA – 1 or SMA – 2 and thereafter constitute a Committee to formulate a Corrective Action Plan.

15. *Per contra*, Ms. Vaishali Bhilare, the learned Counsel

³ WP (C) No.5466 of 2025 dated 6th August, 2025.

appearing for the Respondent – Bank has submitted that the Respondent Bank has over a period of time granted credit facility, renewed the limits and granted further credit limits such as OCC / OBD, Demand Promissory Note Facility, Guaranteed Emergency Credit Line Facility (GECL), Credit Guarantee Scheme for Subordinate Debt (CGSSD) to Petitioner No.1 who has been banking with the Respondent – Bank since the last 14 years and availed all such facilities. She has submitted that the loan account of Petitioner No.1 had slipped into NPA on the aforesaid dates when, the Respondent – Bank, on the request of Petitioner No.1 had renewed the limits and supported Petitioner No.1 to come out of NPA. She has referred to a tabular form at paragraph 4 (c) of the Affidavit in Reply of Respondent Nos.1 to 3 which provides details of the facilities and amounts sanctioned by the Respondent – Bank along with the dates of each sanction.

16. Ms. Bhilare has submitted that the stage of identification of incipient stress in the loan account of MSMEs and categorization under the Special Mention Account (SMA) Category has been clarified by the Supreme Court in *M/s. Pro Knits (Supra)*. She has, in particular, referred to paragraph 16 of the said judgment where the

Supreme Court has held that the period before the loan account of an MSME turns into NPA is a very crucial stage, and therefore, it would be incumbent on the part of the concerned MSME to produce authenticated and verifiable documents / material for substantiating its claim of being MSME, before its account is classified as NPA. If this is not done and once the account is so classified as NPA, the banks i.e. secured creditors would be entitled to take recourse to Chapter III of the SARFAESI Act for the enforcement of its security interest. She has submitted that the account of the Petitioner No.1 turned into NPA and thereafter measures were initiated by the Respondent – Bank for enforcement of its security interest under Chapter III of the SARFAESI Act. She is at pains to point out that Petitioner No.1 had not even objected to the Demand Notice issued by the Respondent – Bank and has instead allowed the process of enforcement of the security interest under the SARFAESI Act to proceed to the stage of auction sale and hence at this belated stage, the Petitioners cannot be permitted to thwart the actions taken by the Respondent – Bank under the SARFAESI Act by raising the plea of being an MSME. This, without first approaching the Respondent – Bank, prior to Petitioner No.1 being declared as NPA, with authenticated and verifiable documents / material to substantiate its claim of being an MSME

disentitles the Petitioners to any reliefs sought in the Petition.

17. Ms. Bhilare has referred to the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in *A. Navinchandra Steels Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors.*⁴, wherein it has been held that although the MSME Notification provides that banks and/or creditors are required to identify the beginning of the stress felt by the MSME in their financial capacity to repay; considering the fact that there are thousands of MSMEs who have raised loans from Banks or NBFCs, such identification is impossible unless the same is brought to the notice of the Bank by the MSME itself.

18. Ms. Bhilare has also relied upon the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in *Perfect Infraengineers Ltd. and Anr. Vs. Board of Directors of ICICI Bank & Ors.*⁵ wherein this Court has held that in the absence of any steps being taken by the Borrower to seek benefit under the MSME Notification, it was not obligatory for the Bank to have categorized the account of the Borrower for benefit under the MSME Notification.

19. Ms. Bhilare has further submitted that the Supreme

⁴ (2024) 1 High Court Cases (Bom.) 290.

⁵ Writ Petition (L) No.4667 of 2024 decided on 1st July, 2024.

Court in *Shri Shri Swami Samarth Construction & Finance Solution and Anr. Vs. The Board of Directors of NKGSB Co-Op. Bank Ltd. & Ors.*⁶ has reiterated its earlier decision in *M/s. Pro Knits (Supra)*. In that case, the Borrower Enterprise did not claim any benefit of the terms of the framework under the MSME Notification, and in the meantime, the Bank had raised a demand notice under Section 13(2) and thereafter, also taken measures under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act and sought compliance of such Order passed by the relevant Magistrate. The Supreme Court, upon examining such events, held that a Petition filed by the Borrower Enterprise at such belated stage to restrain the Bank from proceeding further under the SARFAESI Act exposed (the lack of) its bonafides..

20. Applying the ratio of this judgment to the facts of the present case, Ms. Bhilare has submitted that the Petitioners' account was declared as NPA on 20th October 2024, SMA – 1 on 4th September 2024 and SMA-2 on 23rd September 2024. Despite such classification, she has submitted that no application for initiation of proceedings under the framework of the MSME Notification with a supporting affidavit verified by an authorized person was filed by the

⁶ Writ Petition (Civil) No.684 of 2025 decided on 28th July, 2025.

Petitioner under Clause 1 (3) of the MSME Notification. She has submitted that only if such application (supported by a suitable affidavit), would its account be processed as SMA – 0 and the Committee under this framework would be formed immediately. However, this was admittedly not done by the Petitioners. She has submitted that the account of Petitioner No.1 having slipped into NPA and measures having already been taken under the SARFAESI Act, which have since reached the stage of auction of the secured assets, at this belated stage, the Petitioners cannot now seek any protection under the said MSME Notification. Accordingly, she submits that no reliefs ought to be granted in favour of the Petitioners and the present Writ Petition should instead, be dismissed.

21. We have considered the submissions made by both the parties and have also gone through the record available before this Court. The Supreme Court in *M/s. Pro Knits (Supra)* has held that an MSME has to be vigilant enough to follow the process laid down under the framework provided in the MSME Notification dated 29th May, 2015 and is required to bring to the notice of the concerned bank, by producing authenticated and verifiable documents / material to show its eligibility to get the benefit of the said

framework. Paragraphs 16 and 17 of the said judgment which contains such findings read as under:-

16. We may hasten to add that under the “Framework for Revival and Rehabilitation of MSMEs”, the banks or creditors are required to identify the incipient stress in the account of the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, before their accounts turn into non-performing assets, by creating three sub-categories under the “Special Mention Account” Category, however, while creating such sub-categories, the Banks must have some authenticated and verifiable material with them as produced by the concerned MSME to show that loan account is of a Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise, classified and registered as such under the MSMED Act. The said Framework also enables the Micro, Small or Medium Enterprise to voluntarily initiate the proceedings under the said Framework, by filing an application along with the affidavit of an authorized person. Therefore, the stage of identification of incipient stress in the loan account of MSMEs and categorization under the Special Mention Account category, before the loan account of MSME turns into NPA is a very crucial stage, and therefore it would be incumbent on the part of the concerned MSME also to produce authenticated and verifiable documents / material for substantiating its claim of being MSME, before its account is classified as NPA. If that is not done, and once the account is classified as NPA, the banks i.e. secured creditors would be entitled to Chapter III of the SARFAESI Act for the enforcement of the security interest.

17. It is also pertinent to note that sufficient safeguards have been provided under the said Chapter for safeguarding the interest of the Defaulters-Borrowers for giving them opportunities to discharge their debt. However, if at the stage of classification of the loan

account of the borrower as NPA, the borrower does not bring to the notice of the concerned bank / creditor that it is a Micro, Small or Medium Enterprise under the MSMED Act and if such an Enterprise allows the entire process for enforcement of security interest under the SARFAESI Act to be over, or it having challenged such action of the concerned bank / creditor in the court of law/tribunal and having failed, such an Enterprise could not be permitted to misuse the process of law for thwarting the actions taken under the SARFAESI Act by raising the plea of being an MSME at a belated stage. Suffice it to say, when it is mandatory or obligatory on the part of the Banks to follow the Instructions / Directions issued by the Central Government and the Reserve Bank of India with regard to the Framework for Revival and Rehabilitation of MSMEs, it would be equally incumbent on the part of the concerned MSMEs to be vigilant enough to follow the process laid down under the said Framework, and bring to the notice of the concerned documents / material to show its eligibility to get the benefit of the said Framework.

22. Thus, the Supreme Court has expressly held that the stage of identification of incipient stress in the loan account of MSMEs and the subsequent categorization, under the Special Mention Account (SMA), is required to be done, before the loan account of the MSME turns into NPA, which is the crucial stage. Thus, the Supreme Court has held that it is incumbent on the part of the concerned MSME also to produce authenticated and verifiable documents / material for substantiating its claim of being MSME, before its account is classified as NPA. If that is not done, and once the account of the borrower is classified as NPA, the Banks i.e.

secured creditors would be entitled to take recourse to Chapter III of the SARFAESI Act for enforcement of their security interest.

23. In the present case, admittedly, Petitioner No. 1 has failed to produce any authenticated and/or verifiable material before the Respondent – Bank for identification of incipient stress in its loan account and categorization under the SMA, before its loan account turned into NPA. There is also no application by Petitioner No.1 – MSME submitted to the Respondent – Bank (duly verified by an Affidavit of an authorized person) for processing the account of Petitioner No.1 as SMA – 0 and upon which, a Committee under the framework of the MSME Notification is to be formed immediately. Hence, the Petitioners have failed to meet the mandatory requirement of the framework of the MSME Notification, as has been laid down by the Supreme Court in *M/s. Pro Knits (Supra)*.

24. Moreover, it has been held by the Division Bench of this Court in *Perfect Infraengineer Ltd. (Supra)* which judgment has been tendered by the Respondent – Bank and not by the Petitioners whose duty it was to produce it, being a judgment of a co-ordinate bench of this Court and moreso considering that the Petitioner's Advocate, Mr.

Nedumpara himself who had appeared in the said matter that, in the absence of any steps being taken by the Borrower in seeking the benefit under the MSME Notification, it was not obligatory for the Bank to have categorized the account of the Borrower for availing the benefit under the MSME Notification.

25. It is pertinent to note that the account of Petitioner No.1 has turned NPA on 20th October, 2024 and Demand Notice dated 21st October 2024 has also been issued by the Respondent – Bank under Section 13(2) of the SARFAESI Act. The Petitioners appear to have deliberately not mentioned or disclosed this Demand Notice and have instead, annexed a prior Demand Notice issued by the Respondent – Bank on 22nd August, 2022 at Exhibit ‘N’ to the Petition, which notice had not even been proceeded with by them. The said Demand Notice dated 21st October 2024 issued under Section 13(2) of the SARFAESI Act has since, been followed up by the Possession Notice dated 8th January, 2025 by the Respondent – Bank under Section 13(4) read with Rules 8 and 9 of the Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002. The Petitioners have, at the belated stage of the auction notice for sale of the secured assets, pursuant to the issuance of Demand Notice and Possession Notice, chosen to file the present

Petition by raising the plea of MSME and non-compliance of the MSME Notification. This is nothing but an attempt to thwart the legitimate actions of the Respondent – Bank under the SARFAESI Act. We are of the considered view that at this stage, when the account of Petitioner No.1 has already been classified as NPA, the Petitioners' cannot restrain the Respondent – Bank from taking recourse to Chapter III of the SARFAESI Act to enforce its security interest. The judgment of the Supreme Court in *M/s. Pro Knits (Supra)* is apposite.

26. Further, the Supreme Court in *Shri Shri Swami Samarth Construction & Finance Solution & Anr. (Supra)* has considered a similar case where the Petitioning MSME had not claimed benefit of the directions of the framework under the MSME Notification and it was only at the stage of compliance of an Order passed by the relevant Magistrate under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act that the said Writ Petition came to be presented before the Court to restrain the bank officers from proceeding further under the SARFAESI Act and other enactments. The Supreme Court has, in such circumstances, found the bonafides of the Petitioning MSME to be suspect. The prior judgment of the Supreme Court in *M/s. Pro Knits (Supra)* has been relied upon and the Supreme Court, in the said

decision, was disinclined to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction under Article 32 of the Constitution to interfere, by finding no merit in the said Petition, which came to be dismissed. The Supreme Court has instead observed that the Petitioning MSME is at liberty to pursue its remedy under Section 17 of the SARFAESI Act and in accordance with law.

27. The judgment of the Madras High Court in ***A.K. Karthikeyan (Supra)*** as well as the judgment of the Kerala High Court in ***M/s PDMC Industries (Supra)*** relied upon by Mr. Nedumpara does not support the Petitioners' case. The Madras High Court has infact, relied on the decision of the Supreme Court in ***M/s Pro Knits (Supra)*** which holds that the MSME ought to be vigilant to follow the process laid down under the frame work and bring to the notice of the bank by producing authenticated and verifiable documents to show its eligibility to get the benefits of the framework under the MSME Notification and if the MSME failed to produce such documents then it was not open to the said MSME to claim benefit under the MSME Notification. We find that the mere reference in this judgment to the duty of banks to constitute a committee and / or formulate a scheme for revival which is directed to be incorporated in

the clause for repayment of the loan, cannot detract from the said observations of the Supreme Court in *M/s. Pro Knits (Supra)*.

28. Further, the Division Bench of this Court in *A. Navinchandra Steel Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. (Supra)* has considered the fact that since there are thousands and thousands of MSMEs who have raised loans from the banks or NBFCs, such identification of the beginning of stress felt by the MSME, is impossible unless the same is brought to the notice of the bank by the MSME itself. After all, how a particular borrower is performing in its business and whether any such business is undergoing or beginning to feel stress on its financial capacity, is within the knowledge of the said borrower running its business.

29. We have considered that the present Writ Petition seeks directions to the Central Government and Reserve Bank of India to enforce the MSME Notification dated 29th May 2015 against Respondent - Bank by restraining it from taking recourse to Chapter III of the SARFAESI Act for enforcement of its security interest at the stage when the account of Petitioner No.1 – MSME has already turned NPA. We are constrained to note that it has become habitual

for Advocate Mr. Mathews Nedumpara appearing for Petitioners – MSMEs to raise this issue in repeated matters and seek the same relief, time and again. Concurrently with the present Petition, it has come to our notice that Mr. Nedumpara is urging the same issue before another Division Bench of this Court in ***Ms. Manisha Nimesh Mehta Vs. Technology Development Board & Ors.***⁷. Given the settled law as laid down by the Supreme Court in ***M/s. Pro Knits (Supra)*** and followed in the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court and this Court, the bonafides of the present Petitioners are suspect.

30. Accordingly, we find no merit in the present Petition which calls for any interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

31. The present Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

32. The Interim Application filed therein does not survive and is accordingly disposed of.

[FARHAN P. DUBASH, J.]

[R.I. CHAGLA J.]

⁷ Writ Petition (St.)No.14829 of 2025