IN THE DEBTS RECOVERY TRIBUNAL-III, CHENNAI

Dated this the 12th day of October, 2026

Present: SMT. S.V. GOWRAMMA
Presiding Officer

SARFAESI APPLICATION No. 28 of 2025

C. Augustin Jebaraj,
S/o. Chithiraj Swamiyadian,
No.4/21, Swornambigai Nagar,
Opp. A.K.R. Mahal,
Virugambakkam,
Chennai – 600 092. ….Applicant

-Vs-

Edelweiss Asset Reconstruction Company Ltd.,
Rep. by its Authorized Officer,
Edelweiss House,
Off. C.S.T. Road, Kalina,
Santacruz,
Mumbai – 400 098. ….Respondent

Counsels on record / appeared:

Counsel for Applicant : Mr. A. Balasingh Ramanujam

Counsel for respondent : M/s. V. Balasubramani

ORDER ON SA 28/2025

1. The applicant borrower has challenged the Sec.14 Order dated 19.11.2024 in Crl.M.P. No.41232 of 2024 passed by Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore Chennai and the outstanding amount due as per Sec.14 order is Rs.63,86,436.12/-

2. The Applicant availed a business loan of Rs.35 lakhs from the HDB Financial Services Ltd., pursuant to which Loan Agreement was entered into between the Applicant and the respondent on 29.09.2011. Due to certain defaults, HDB Financial Services Ltd. had initiated arbitration proceedings

against the Applicant in Arb.No.1556/2016, allegedly altering the jurisdiction clause from Chennai to Mumbai, obtained an award dated 28.01.2017. Pursuant to the award, HDB Financial Services Ltd, filed execution proceedings before the Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, in E.P. No. 2205/2017.

3. The Applicant filed a petition in E.A. No. 1/2020 under Order 21 Rule 29 of the CPC, seeking stay of the execution proceedings. Thereafter, HDB Financial Services Ltd. agreed to settle the matter with the Applicant by waiving the interest and penalty and received the entire amount due from the Applicant. Accordingly, HDB Financial Services Ltd. had filed a Termination Memo before the XIth Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, and the Court had terminated the execution proceedings by order dated 15.04.2021. Therefore, the matter was settled out of court in accordance with the court order.

4. It is submitted that the applicant filed a Writ Petition in W.P. No. 16829 of 2021 before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras seeking for return of the original documents. The Hon'ble High Court by order dated 02.02.2022 directed HDB Financial Services Ltd., to return the original documents to the applicant within four weeks. However, HDB Financial Services Ltd. failed to comply with the order. Consequently, the applicant was constrained to initiate Contempt Petition No. 1182 of 2022 before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras. But the company had stated that the original documents were handed over to the respondent company and that the documents could not be returned. The Hon'ble High Court imposed a fine

of Rs.25,000/- on HDB Financial Services Ltd. and directed the company to agitate the matter before the IXth Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai.

5. Accordingly, HDB Financial Services Ltd. paid the fine amount of Rs.25,000/- imposed by the Hon'ble High Court to the Adyar Cancer Institute, Madras and filed E.A. No. 2/2022 seeking restoration of E.P. No. 2205/2017 before the IXth Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai. However, the said application was dismissed as withdrawn by the Hon'ble Court on 09.06.2023.

6. It is submitted that HDB Financial Services Ltd. fraudulently entered into an Assignment Agreement with the respondent by suppressing the above facts and assigned the debt vide Assignment Agreement, pertaining to the same cause of action, was registered between the parties at two different places, first at Mumbai, vide Doc. No. Badar 17/6561/2021, dated 17.02.2021, while the E.P. proceedings were pending before the Court; and subsequently, at Chennai, on 02.09.2021, vide Doc. No. 7516/2021, registered before the Sub-Registrar Office, Pallavaram, Chennai, after the termination of the E.P. proceedings.

7. It is further submitted that the Assignment Agreement executed and registered between HDB Financial Services Ltd. and the Respondent is purely illegal, as the matter had already been settled out of court between the Applicant and HDB Financial Services Ltd on 15.04.2021. Despite the said settlement, the Applicant were shocked and surprised, the respondent

issued a Demand Notice u/s.13(2) of the SARFAESI Act on 28.04.2023, demanding a sum of Rs.56,35,490.25/-.

8. Thereafter, the respondent again issued another Demand Notice dated 06.03.2024, claiming a sum of Rs.62,14,740.19/- to which the applicant, through his counsel Mr. M. Balasubramanian, submitted a reply dated 19.05.2023, and through his counsel, Mr. A.Muruganandam, submitted another reply dated 15.03.2024, raising objections to the demand. Therefore the demand notice issued by the respondent to the Applicant is purely illegal, arbitrary, and contrary to law, and therefore liable to be set aside.

9. In the grounds, it is contended that the Applicant had availed a loan from HDB Financial Services Ltd., and the entire amount due and payable to HDB Financial Services Ltd. was settled in the E.P proceedings on 15-04-2021, as per the order passed by the IX Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, after waiving the interest and penalty.

10. It is submitted that the HDB Financial Services Ltd. had not returned the original documents to the Applicant even after the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras. Due to the non-compliance of the said order, the Hon'ble High Court imposed a fine on HDB Financial Services Ltd. in the contempt proceedings in Cont.P.No.1182 of 2022.

11. The respondent suppressed the facts and fraudulently entered into an Assignment Agreement with HDB Financial Services Ltd., which is illegal.

HDB Financial Services Ltd. had fraudulently altered the jurisdiction clause of the Arbitration Agreement dated 29.09.2011 and obtained an award in Arb.No.1556 of 2016.

12. It is contended that the demand notice dated 28.04.2023 issued by the respondent is illegal for which the objection letter dated 19.05.2023 and also issued by the applicant. The Applicant submitted a reply notice dated 15.03.2024 to the demand notice issued u/s.13(2) of the Act, dated 06.03.2024. The respondent has no right or authority to issue such a demand notice to the Applicant. One these grounds, the applicant prays to set aside the Sec.14 order passed by Ld. CMM, Egmore dated 19.11.2024.

13. The respondent bank has filed a detailed counter, contending that the applicant has filed numerous applications raising the same allegation that he settled the loan amount. However, the same were rejected by the courts, as the applicant failed and neglected to submit the proof for the alleged payment made by them as detailed hereunder apart from this application filed before this Tribunal.

Sl. No.	Case Type	Case No.	Court	Order
1.	Execution Petition	E.P/2205 /2017	IX Asst CCC	HBD Mistakenly withdrawn, could not restore, Hence E.P. Withdrawn.
2.	Write Petition	W.P/1682 9/2021	High Court Madras	Directing that if the EA is not numbered the second respondent is directed to return the subject documents to the Petitioner.
3.	Contempt Petition	Cont.P/1 182/2022	High Court Madras	Cost of Rs.25,000/- was ordered to be payable to

				the Adyar Cancer Institute by the respondent.
4.	Consumer Complaint	CC/21/2024	District Consumer Forum Perambalur	After submitting our Written Version and documents the commission has rejected the complaint as he failed to substantiate his grievance.
5.	Writ Petition	W.P/32627/2022	High Court Madras	Directed the Borrower to submit the proof and since he failed to submit any proof that he settled the loan, hence dismissed.
6.	Consumer Appeal	FA/400/2024	State Consumer Forum	Pending before the Forum.
7.	Appeal in Section 14 Petition	Crl.M.P.No.74072/2024	High Court Madras	No authority to Recall or Set Aside the Section 14 order hence the Petition filed by the Petitioner/Respondent is dismissed.
8.	Writ Petition	W.P/39766/2024	High Court Madras	Challenge the order before DRT.

14. It is contended that the Applicant had originally availed a loan of Rs.35,00,000/- from M/s. HDB Financial Services Limited (the Original Lender) vide Loan A/c. No. 34253. The Applicant and the other borrower had executed the necessary loan documents and other relevant documents in favour of M/s. HDB Financial Services Limited. The Applicants also created an equitable mortgage in favour of the original lender and the property, as described in the Schedule to the SA, as security for repayment of the said loan.

15. It is submitted that, in the course of their business, M/s. HDB Financial Services Limited had assigned the loan to the Respondent herein vide Assignment Agreement dated 02.09.2021. Consequently, the

Respondent stepped into the shoes of M/s. HDB Financial Services Limited and all the rights, title, and interest in respect of the financial assets, along with the underlying security interest, guarantees, and pledges to exercise all rights as a secured creditor.

16. As the Applicant failed to adhere to the terms of the loan agreement and defaulted in payments of monthly instalments, the respondent had classified the Applicant's accounts as NPA on 04.06.2016 in accordance with section 2(o) of the SARFAESI Act. The respondent issued statutory Notice under Section 13(2) of the Act on 06.03.2024 calling upon the Applicant to discharge their liabilities in full within 60 days from the date of receipt of the said notice. The Demand Notice was duly served on the borrower and co-borrower.

17. It is submitted that respondent being the secured creditor upon default by the borrower after statutory notice under section 13(2) of the Act, are entitled to proceed against the borrower filed an application U/s.14 of the Act, before the Hon'ble CMM Court, Egmore in Crl.M.P. No.41232 of 2024 and the Court vide order dated 19.11.2024 appointed an Advocate Commissioner to take physical possession of the property.

18. The respondent denies the averments in the SA, submitting that the Original Lender, M/s. HDB Financial Services Limited, had assigned the loan agreement to the Respondent vide a Deed of Assignment, whereby all rights to recover the outstanding dues payable by the Applicant were assigned to the Respondent. Accordingly, the Respondent is entitled to

recover the outstanding dues from the Applicant in the capacity of the assignee of the Original Lender.

19. It is further submitted that, by virtue of the Deed of Assignment, the Original Lender M/s. HBD Financial had assigned the loan account of the applicant to the respondent and the same was intimated to the counsel. Accordingly, while doing so the counsel for the original lender by oversight filed a petition to withdraw the above referred execution petition on the apprehension that the due amount payable by the applicant was settled insisted of filing an application that the loan account was assigned to the respondent. Hence, the Original Lender withdraw the said proceedings with liberty to proceed a fresh execution proceedings through the assignee. However, the applicant did not settle any amount towards the outstanding dues.

20. It is submitted that the Applicant filed W.P. No. 16829 of 2021 seeking a direction to the Original Lender to consider the representation dated 22.07.2021 for the return of documents, and the Hon'ble High Court passed an order dated 02.02.2022.

21. It is submitted that the respondent tried to number the E.A. petition filed in E.A. No. 2 of 2022, which was pending before the IX Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, in E.P. No. 2205 of 2017. In the meantime, the applicant had also initiated contempt proceedings in Contempt Petition No. 1182 of 2022. It is further submitted that, in the contempt proceedings, the respondent submitted before the Hon'ble High Court that the assignor

had mistakenly withdrawn the execution proceedings as settled, instead of withdraw the proceeding as they assigned the loan to the respondents, with liberty to file a fresh application. The respondent further submitted that the Hon'ble High Court directed the Original Lender to pay a sum of Rs.25,000/- to the Cancer Institute of Adyar.

22. It is contended that, at the time of execution of the Assignment Agreement, a sum of Rs.41,22,311.87/- was due and payable by the Applicant, as detailed herein, as on 10.12.2020. Further, as per Clause 25 of the Loan Agreement, the Assignor was entitled to assign the Agreement to any person, and accordingly, the Respondent entered into an Assignment Agreement with the Lender.

23. It is further contended that the Applicant failed to settle the outstanding dues, and hence the Assignor filed E.P. No. 2205/2017 before the IX Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai. Subsequently, the said loan account was assigned to the Respondent. However, the case has been withdrawn on the captioned that the matter has been settled and hence, the execution proceedings have also been withdrawn, as on today a sum of Rs.67,75,524/- is due and payable as on 27.01.2025.

24. The applicant has filed a consumer complaint before the Hon'ble District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Perambalur vide C.C.No.21 of 2024 seeking a direction to the respondent to hand over all the originals documents, relying upon the settlement memo filed by the original lender before the execution court. After hearing both parties, the

Hon'ble District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Perambalur has dismissed the complaint filed by the applicant. The respondent bank denies all the averments made in the present SA and also followed all the measures as required. Hence, the respondent bank prays for dismissal of the SA.

25. The applicant and the respondent Bank have filed their written arguments.

Heard both sides of the Counsels and perused the records of the case.

26. The records of the case reflects that the applicant availed a Loan of Rs.35 Lakhs from M/s. HDB Financial Service Limited (the Original Lender) which was Sanctioned and disbursed under loan Agreement dated 29.09.2011 in Loan A/c.No.34253, against the secured property. The applicant agreed to repay the loan in 96 EMI's of Rs.62,809/- per month and executed relevant document in favour of M/s. HDB Financial Service Limited and also created an equitable mortgage in respect of the property covered by the Sale Deed dated 25.11.1992, registered as Doc.No.3963/1992, as security for the said loan, as is seen from the Sec.14 order.

27. The Original Lender, M/s. HDB Financial Service Limited, had assigned the financial assets/debt due and payable by the borrower arising out of the loan, together with the underlying securities, in favour of M/s.

Edel Weiss Asset Reconstruction Company Limited, vide Assignment Agreement dated 02.09.2021.

28. Accordingly, the Respondent is entitled to recover the outstanding dues from the Applicant in the capacity of the assignee of the Original Lender and Assignment of debt from the Original Lender M/s. HBD Financial to the respondent was intimated to the counsel. But the counsel for the original lender by oversight filed a petition to withdraw the above referred execution petition on the apprehension that the due amount payable by the applicant was settled insisted of filing an application that the loan account was assigned to the respondent. Hence, the Original Lender withdraw the said proceedings with liberty to proceed a fresh execution proceedings through the assignee. However, the applicant did not settle any amount towards the outstanding dues and thought it is specific case of the applicant that the loan account is closed with the original lender is not supported by any loan closure statement or nan account is settled fails nor no due certificate issued by the lender. Hence the contention of the appellant that the loan account is closed as settled.

29. It is matter of records that the respondent tried to number the E.A. petition filed in E.A. No. 2 of 2022, which was pending before the IX Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, in E.P. No. 2205 of 2017. However, the applicant had initiated contempt proceedings in Contempt Petition No. 1182 of 2022 and the respondent submitted before the Hon’ble High Court that the assignor had mistakenly withdrawn the execution proceedings as

settled, instead of withdraw the proceeding as they assigned the loan to the respondents, with liberty to file a fresh application, further directed the Original Lender to pay a sum of Rs.25,000/- to the Cancer Institute of Adyar.

30. Further at the time of execution of the Assignment Agreement, the applicant was due a sum of Rs.41,22,311.87/- as on 10.12.2020. As the Applicant failed to settle the outstanding dues, the Assignor filed E.P. No. 2205/2017 before the IX Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai. Subsequently, the said loan account was assigned to the Respondent. However, the case has been withdrawn on the captioned that the matter has been settled and hence, the execution proceedings have also been withdrawn.

31. The applicant has filed a consumer complaint before the Hon'ble District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Perambalur in C.C.No.21 of 2024 seeking a direction to the respondent to hand over all the originals documents, relying upon the settlement memo filed by the original lender before the execution court. After hearing both parties, the Hon'ble District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Perambalur has dismissed the complaint filed by the applicant.

32. It is pertinent to note that the applicant does not dispute the availing of credit facility or mortgage of the property as security and the assignment of debt to the respondent herein. The contention that the loan account is settled is not supported by any documents, hence the respondent has

initiated measures under the Act for the recovery of the amount due by enforcing the security available to them.

33. Admittedly, the borrower and the co-borrower committed defaults in repayment of the loan, and the respondent, being the secured creditor, initiated measures under the SARFAESI Act after classifying the loan account as an NPA on 04.06.2016, in accordance with the RBI guidelines.

34. Subsequently, the respondent issued a Sec.13(2) Demand Notice to the applicant on 28.04.2023, demanding an amount of Rs.56,35,490.25/- due as on 28.04.2023. The applicant, through his counsel, Mr. M. Balasubramanian, submitted a reply notice dated 19.05.2023, raising his objections to the demand notice dated 28.04.2023 which is produced at Pg.94-99 of the SA Book.

35. It is seen that the applicant admits availing the loan from M/s. HDB Financial Services Limited., arbitration proceedings and decree obtained by the respondent bank. Further, it is contended that the decree was fully satisfied, hence the executing court terminated the E.P as early as on 15.04.2021, after hearing both the parties. It is further alleged fraudulently the respondent M/s. HDB Financial Service Limited have executed an Assignment Deed dated 02.09.2021 when was no loan pending with the HDB Financial Services limited. Hence, the applicant had initiated civil and criminal proceedings against M/s. HDB Financial Service Limited and directed Edelweiss Asset Reconstruction Company Limited to withdraw the Sec.13(2) Demand Notice.

36. Subsequently, the respondent ARC has issued a Demand Notice dated 06.03.2024 u/s.13(2) of the Act, intimating the applicant about the loan availed from M/s. HDB Financial Services, and the Assignment of Deed vide assignment agreement dated 02.09.2021 and the classification of the account as NPA on 04.06.2016 and issued the sec.13(2) Demand Notice claiming an amount of Rs.62,14,740.19/- calling upon them to pay the outstanding amount and also bringing to the notice of the applicant the prohibited provision u/s.13(13).

37. On receipt of the Sec.13(2) Demand Notice dated 06.03.2024 the applicant yet again replied on 15.03.2024, contending that they have filed W.P.No.32627 of 2022 and the account is settled to HDB Financial Services to which the HDB Financial services and have also filed the termination memo in EP.No.2205/2017. Hence, the applicant vide replied to Sec.13(2) demand notice submitted that it is in contempt of court in issuing the Sec.13(2) demand notice.

38. Thereafter, the respondent issued another Demand Notice to the applicant on 06.03.2024, claiming an amount of Rs.62,14,740.19/-. Wherein the earlier Demand Notice issued stood withdrawn and that the present notice was to be considered as fresh notice u/s.13(2). Subsequently, the applicant through his counsel, Mr. Muruganandam, submitted a further reply notice dated 15.03.2024, raising additional objections to the Demand Notice dated 06.03.2024, which is produced at Pg.100-107 of the SA Book.

39. However, the writ petition came to be disposed of vide order dated 01.04.2024, directing the Department of Banking Supervision, Reserve Bank of India, Ahmadabad to deal with the complaint which was lodged by the petitioner and conducted enquiry. Further it is also clarified by the respondent ARC that the account was not closed and inadvertently the counsel on record had filed the Termination memo. Hence the said contention cannot sustain.

40. Both Demand Notices issued under Section 13(2) of the SARFAESI Act are duly served upon the Applicant, which is not disputed. Consequently, the Demand Notice was published in two newspapers one in English "Business Standard" and another one in Tamil "Dinakaran" both dated 04.04.2024. The paper publication is also recorded in the Sec.14 order.

41. Despite receipt of the Demand Notices, as the applicants did not come forward to repay the dues, respondent bank proceeded further under the SARFAESI Act and had approached the Ld. CMM for taking physical possession of secured asset.

42. It is established by the respondent that there are no infirmities in the procedure adopted by the respondent bank, and the same is found to be in accordance with law. Accordingly, S.13[2] Demand Notice dated 06.03.2024 is held to be a valid notice issued in accordance with the Act and the Rules made under. The applicant has failed to make out any case

of infirmities or violations in the S.14 Order or in the measures taken by the secured creditor under the Act.

43. The applicant has filed I.A.No.1034/2025 seeking for a direction to return the original documents to which the respondent has not filed any counter. The same cannot be adjudicated without clearing the entire liability towards the loan account, it is clarified that on payment of the entire outstanding loan amount due, the respondent is directed to return the original documents after satisfying the closure of loan account in accordance with law as prescribed.

44. For the foregoing reasons, the present SA fails and accordingly SA stands dismissed. Interim Order granted, if any stands vacated, pending IAs are disposed of in terms of this final order. No order as to cost.

Sd/-
(S.V. GOWRAMMA)
PRESIDING OFFICER,
DRT-III, CHENNAI

(*Dictated to Steno (Suriya), transcribed by him, corrected, signed and pronounced by me on this the 12th day of October, 2026)*

ANNEXURES

LIST OF DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY THE APPLICANT

Sl. No.	Description of Documents	Documents No.
1.	Loan Agreement (Chennai Jurisdiction) dated 29.09.2011	A-1
2.	Loan Agreement fraudulently altered by HDB Financial Services Ltd. Jurisdiction as Mumbai instead of Chennai dated 29.09.2011.	A-2
3.	Arbitration Award at Mumbai dated 28.01.2017.	A-3

4.	E.P. petition filed by HDB Financial Services Ltd. before IX Assistant City Civil Court in E.P.No.2205/2017 dated 27.07.2016.	A-4
5.	E.A.1/2020 filed before EP Court for stay of EP Proceedings dated 24.02.2020.	A-5
6.	Termination Memo filed by HDB Financial Services Ltd. in E.P. No.2205/2017 dated 15.04.2021.	A-6
7.	Order passed by IX Assistant City Civil Court Chennai in E.P.No.2205/2017 dated 15.04.2021.	A-7
8.	E.A.No.2/2022 in E.P.No.2205/ 2017 Affidavit and Petition dated 28.04.2022.	A-8
9.	E.A.No.2/2022 in E.P.No.2205/ 2017 order passed by Hon'ble IX Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai dated 09.06.2023.	A-9
10.	Order Passed by Hon'ble High Court in W.P.No.16829/2021 dated 02.02.2022.	A-10
11.	Contempt No.1182/2022 order passed by High Court, Madras dated 26.08.2022.	A-11
12.	Fine paid by HDB Financial Services Ltd. as ordered by High Court to Cancer Institute Adyar dated 05.09.2022.	A-12
13.	Demand Notice issued by Defendant dated 28.04.2023.	A-13
14.	Reply Notice to the demand notice dated 28.04.2023 dated 19.05.2023.	A-14
15.	Demand Notice issued by defendant dated 06.03.2024.	A-15
16.	Reply notice to defendant dated 15.03.2024	A-16
17.	Order passed by Hon'ble High Court in W.P.No.30358/2022 dated 01.04.2024.	A-17
18.	Petition U/s 14 of SARFEASI Act dated 14.06.2024.	A-18
19.	Order passed by Hon'ble CMM, Egmore, in Crl.M.P. 41232/2024 u/s 14 of SARFAESI Act dated 19.11.2024.	A-19
20.	Affidavit ant Writ Petition in WP.No: 39766/2024 before Hon'ble High Court Madras dated 16.12.2024.	A-20
21.	Order Passed By Hon'ble High Court Madras in WP.No: 39766/2024 dated 27.12.2024.	A-21
22.	Statement of Account of HDB Financial Services Ltd. in Loan Account No 34253.	A-22
23.	Encumbrance Certificate.	A-23

LIST OF DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY THE RESPONDNET

Sl. No.	Description of Documents	Documents No.
1.	Copy of Assignment Agreement dated 02.10.2021.	R-1
2.	Copy of 13(2) Notice with Tracking dated 06.03.2024.	R-2
3.	Copy of Order passed in Crl.M.P.No.41232/2024 by the Hon'ble Chief Judicial Magistrate, Egmore dated 19.11.2024.	R-3
4.	Copy of Order passed in Crl.M.P.No.74072/2024 in Crl.M.P.No.41232/2024 by the Hon'ble Chief Judicial Magistrate, Egmore dated 09.01.2025.	R-4
5.	Copy of order passed by the District Consumer redressal commission, perambalur in C.C.No.21 of 2024 dated 28.02.2024.	R-5
6.	Copy of order passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras in W.P.No.32627/2022 dated 12.04.2024.	R-6
7.	Copy of statement of accounts dated 11.07.2024.	R-7
8.	Copy of Foreclosure letter dated 11.07.2024.	R-8
9.	Copy of Authorization letter dated 22.08.2024.	R-9

SCHEDULE OF PROPERTY

All that piece and parcel of vacant land and budding situated at No: 104, Door No.4/21, Virugambakkam Village, Swornambigai Nagar bearing Survey No. 70/2 Present Survey No.70/10 as per document measuring an extent of 3083 square feet as per sketch, the present measurement 3020 sq. feet land bounded on the:-

North: 24 Feet Road

South : Land and building belongs Muthu Pazhaniappan

East: Road

West: Vacant House site

Admeasuring:-

North: 44 Feet 6 inches

South: 45 Feet 6 inches

East: 68 Feet

West: 68 Feet

Totaling in all 3083 sq. ft. as per document 3020 sq.ft. as per the Sketch situated in Patta No. 2196 property situated within the Registration District of South Chennai and Sub-registration district of Virugambakkam.

Sd/-
(S.V. GOWRAMMA)
PRESIDING OFFICER,
DRT-III, CHENNAI