REAL ESTATE

Understanding Property Attachment in Execution of Court Decrees: A Legal Perspective

AUTHOR Suresh Palav, Rahul Sundaram

PUBLISHED 28 February 2025

The recent decision by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, Lucknow Bench, has highlighted critical legal principles related to the attachment and auction of property in execution proceedings. This case revolved around whether property belonging to third parties could be auctioned to satisfy a decree against a company.

Table of contents

Background of the Case

The dispute began when Dhajaram Charitable Trust filed a suit in the Saket Court, New Delhi, against Lavanaya Ayurvedic Pvt. Ltd. for the recovery of arrears, rent, and damages. The court ruled in favor of the trust, issuing an ex-parte decree against the company for Rs. 17,99,366, along with interest. Importantly, the decree did not impose any personal liability on the company's director, Sangeeta Srivastava.

Following the decree, execution proceedings were initiated in the District Court, Lucknow, to recover the amount. The decree holder sought to attach and auction a property located in Chinhat, Lucknow, claiming it belonged to the judgment debtor company. However, the property was actually owned by Ashok Kumar Srivastava, who had passed away, and had subsequently been inherited by his legal heirs.

Legal Dispute Over Property Ownership

The core issue in this case was whether the attached and auctioned property belonged to the company. The petitioners, who were the legal heirs of Ashok Kumar Srivastava, argued that the property was never transferred to the company. They contended that no registered deed assigned ownership to the company, and the mere use of the premises by the company did not make it a company asset.

On the other hand, the decree holder argued that the property was listed in the company's balance sheets, suggesting ownership. Additionally, a previous civil revision had ruled in favor of the decree holder, and it was claimed that the present petitioners were bound by that judgment.

Court's Analysis and Findings

The court emphasized that under the Transfer of Property Act, ownership of immovable property can only be transferred through a registered sale deed. In this case, no such deed existed, which meant the property continued to belong to Ashok Kumar Srivastava and, after his death, to his heirs.

It also noted that the provisions of **Order 21 Rule 14 of the Civil Procedure Code (CPC)**, which require verification of ownership before attachment, were not followed. The executing court failed to confirm whether the property was legally owned by the judgment debtor company before allowing the auction.

The court further clarified that **merely showing an asset in the company's financial records does not establish ownership**. A company cannot claim ownership of property unless it has been legally transferred through a registered instrument.

Violation of Legal Procedures in Execution Proceedings

The judgment pointed out that execution proceedings must strictly adhere to legal requirements. The attachment and sale of a property must be based on clear ownership by the judgment debtor. If a property does not legally belong to the debtor, it cannot be used to satisfy a court decree.

The court found that the auction and sale of the property were unlawful because they involved assets owned by third parties who were not liable for the decree. The entire execution process was deemed invalid, and all related orders were quashed.

Implications of the Judgment

This ruling reinforces the importance of due diligence in execution proceedings. Courts must verify ownership before allowing the attachment and auction of property. The case also highlights that third parties whose properties are wrongfully attached have the right to challenge such actions under Article 227 of the Constitution.

Additionally, the judgment makes it clear that a **company's financial statements alone cannot establish property ownership**. The correct legal process must be followed to determine ownership before a court takes any action.

Final Decision

The court ruled in favour of the petitioners, quashing the auction and ordering that the auction purchaser be refunded. The decree holder was directed to pursue execution only against assets legally owned by the company. The court also imposed a fine on one of the petitioners for failing to disclose relevant facts in earlier proceedings.

Conclusion

This case is an important precedent for execution proceedings and property rights. It underscores the need for strict adherence to legal procedures when attaching and auctioning property. The judgment protects individuals from wrongful loss of property due to errors in execution proceedings and reinforces the principle that **only a debtor's assets can be used to satisfy a legal decree**.

For further details write to contact@indialaw.in