

|| Shree Ganeshaya Namah||

**NANDINI TEXCOM (INDIA) LIMITED**

**CIN: L65910GJ1994PLC021165**

**Reg. Office: B-304, International Commerce Center, Near Kadiwala School, Ring Road, Surat-395002.**

**Tel:0261-4004596 Email: nandinitexcom@hotmail.com, website: nandinitex.com**

---

Date: 01<sup>ST</sup> June, 2026

To,  
The Listing Department  
MSEI LIMITED  
205(A), 2nd floor, Piramal Agastya Corporate Park,  
Kamani Junction, LBS Road,  
Kurla (West), Mumbai – 400070.

Symbol: NANDINI - Series: EQ

Subject: Newspaper Advertisement- Results for the quarter and year ended on March 31, 2026.

Dear Sir,

Pursuant to Regulations 47 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, we are enclosing herewith the newspaper advertisement for the standalone Audited Financial Results of Nandini Texcom (India) Limited ('the Company') for quarter and year ended on March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2026, published on 01<sup>ST</sup> June, 2026 in the following newspapers:

- a. Free Press
- b. Lokmitra

These are also being made available on the Company's website at [www.nandinitex.com](http://www.nandinitex.com)

This is for your information and records.

Yours Faithfully,  
**For, Nandini Texcom (India) Limited**

---

**PAYAL KRISHAN KHURANA**  
Company Secretary & Compliance Officer

## India's technical rise must be built on frugal innovation



As the global commentary poured in following the India AI Impact Summit in February 2026, a familiar anxiety resurfaced: scholars and practitioners argued that middle powers such as India lack the capital investment bandwidth and institutional infrastructure to build their own indigenous AI full stacks, and implied that they should instead focus on building unique use-cases at scale atop AI architectures built elsewhere. This argument, while not without merit, mistakes a constraint for a ceiling. India has demonstrated in consequential domains that resource scarcity does not preclude technological ambition; rather, it sharpens it. The imperative now is to institutionalise this instinct.

The key question being posed before India is this: How does a capital-constrained civilisation compete in a century defined by compute, chips, and AI infrastructure? The defining technological challenge for India is not whether it can outpace the United States or outscale China. It is whether a civilisation with limited resources can pioneer a different model of technological advancement altogether. India's AI story cannot be a mimicry of capital-heavy innovation models built in Silicon Valley or Shenzhen; rather, it should focus on building a sovereign, scalable, and frugal technological civilisation. At the core of India's unique trajectory in scientific advancement lie its capabilities in frugal innovation.

A millennium of colonisation had left India without economic resources and bereft of a scientific establishment. It is to the credit of early institution-builders such as CV Raman, Vikram Sarabhai, Meghnad Saha and PC Mahalanobis that India was able to create a scientific culture and innovate across domains against all odds. India's institution-builders in science and technology were not merely administrators or engineers. They were civilisational architects who built enduring capability under conditions of extreme scarcity. This historical backdrop is central to today's discussions revolving around R&D and technological innovation. India's tradition of doing more with fewer resources is not mere improvisation; it is a distinct innovation methodology with a philosophical lineage that deserves serious intellectual treatment alongside Silicon Valley's "move fast and break things", or China's state-directed scale plays. Frugal innovation as a distinct philosophy must not be conflated with the art of building cheap substitutes. It should be understood as the discipline of maximising societal impact per unit of capital, infrastructure, and energy. The concept of jugaad, loosely translated as workarounds, but culturally understood as constraint-driven ingenuity, is an anecdotal innovation emphasising Indians' entrepreneurial, solution-oriented approach. India's jugaad democracy has systematically produced world-class outcomes in scientific domains. Indian innovation culture has historically evolved around constraint-driven systems thinking, proving its ability to engineer scalable solutions for

the Indian population despite severe limitations of income, infrastructure, and institutional access. To cite an instance, ISRO's Mangalyaan Mars mission cost less than the production budget of the Hollywood film Gravity. The Jaipur Foot, a cost-effective prosthetic limb developed for amputees as far back as 1969, was another instance of frugal innovation directed at empowering the populace of developing countries with limited access to costly medical infrastructure. For that matter, the Unified Payments Interface (UPI), built on open-source digital architecture, has turned into a medium for transaction volumes rivalling global payment giants. Indian history of science and technology in the 20th century has witnessed multiple case studies of frugal innovation. However, a sharp line of distinction must be drawn between frugal innovation and underfunded innovation. Celebration of frugality cannot be an apology for the underfunding of scientific institutions, nor should frugal innovation become an ideological justification for chronic underinvestment in science and research. Just as adequate funding does not translate into an open call for the splurging of resources, similarly frugality does not automatically create leeway for innovators to be trapped in a scarcity mindset. Rather, frugality in innovation demands a design orientation that asks, from the outset, how to engineer for the constrained majority rather than the affluent minority. It is this genius of scientific minds to build core and frontier technologies unconventionally that needs to be retained as the mark of India's competitive identity. India's challenge is not to glorify scarcity, but to combine capital efficiency with scientific excellence. The 21st Century Opportunity and the China Challenge - Kishore Mahbubani, the founding dean of the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, in his seminal work The Asian 21st Century, has argued that the 21st century is witnessing the return of Asian economies to the world stage, and that the emergence.

aimed to squeeze the revolutionary government economically and politically, but in practice it also helped Castro consolidate power by giving Havana a permanent external enemy against which to mobilise nationalist sentiment. For generations of Cubans, resistance to US pressure became a central pillar of the revolution's legitimacy. For generations of US politicians, Cuba especially became a test case of whether Washington would tolerate an anti-American communist state in its backyard. The failed Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961 locked this antagonism in place. The CIA-backed operation, carried out by Cuban exiles, was intended to topple Castro but instead strengthened him, humiliating Washington while convincing Havana that US regime-change efforts were not hypothetical but real and persistent. After this, any possibility of quick reconciliation vanished. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis transformed bilateral hostility into a global nuclear confrontation. When US reconnaissance discovered Soviet nuclear missile sites in Cuba in October 1962, President Kennedy imposed a naval "quarantine" and demanded their removal. The crisis ended only after a bargain in which the Soviets dismantled the missiles, the US pledged not to invade Cuba, and Washington secretly agreed to remove missiles from Turkey. Although nuclear war was avoided, Cuba's place in US strategic thinking was permanently fixed: it was no longer just an ideological challenge but a possible platform for hostile powers threatening the American mainland. That logic outlived the Cold War. Even after the Soviet Union collapsed, the embargo remained, justified by concerns about authoritarian rule, political repression, and unresolved property claims. Brief openings, including the Obama administration's effort to restore diplomatic ties and expand travel and remittances, showed that coexistence was possible, but they did not erase the embedded structural distrust. The relationship remained vulnerable to reversal, and Trump's return to office has demonstrated just how reversible that thaw was. Bad Relations The recent deterioration in US-Cuba ties is driven by a convergence of economic collapse inside Cuba and a

# Trump's next target? Cuba gamble risks turning Caribbean into a boiling pot again

The United States and Cuba have spent more than six decades trapped in a relationship defined by distrust, coercion, and missed opportunities for normalisation. That history matters because the current escalation under US President Donald Trump is not an isolated flare-up but the latest chapter in a long-running struggle over ideology, sovereignty, security, and power in the Caribbean.

What makes the present moment especially fraught is that old grievances are now being fused with a severe humanitarian crisis inside Cuba, renewed US sanctions, legal escalation against the Castro-era leadership, and a far more explicit conversation in Washington about regime change. US Secretary of State Marco Rubio has said the likelihood of a negotiated agreement with Cuba is "not high," even while insisting that the US remains open to diplomacy if Havana changes course. That formulation captures the contradiction at the centre of the current impasse: Washington says it prefers a peaceful outcome, but its pressure campaign is designed to convince Cuba's rulers that survival under the present system is no longer possible.

This is why Cuba has re-emerged as the next frontier for Trump. It is geographically close, politically symbolic, emotionally resonant in US domestic politics, and increasingly framed by the administration as a national security threat. To understand why the relationship has historically been at loggerheads, why it has deteriorated so sharply again, and why Trump appears to be pressing towards an endgame, it is necessary to begin with where it all started. Where it All Began The rupture began with the Cuban Revolution of 1959, when Fidel Castro overthrew Fulgencio Batista, a dictator whose government had long enjoyed US backing. As the revolutionary government nationalised American-owned assets and aligned itself more closely with the Soviet Union, Washington concluded that Cuba had moved from being a difficult neighbour to a hostile ideological outpost just 90 miles off the coast of Florida. The first decisive break came with the US embargo, launched in 1960 and hardened in the years that followed. The embargo

aimed to squeeze the revolutionary government economically and politically, but in practice it also helped Castro consolidate power by giving Havana a permanent external enemy against which to mobilise nationalist sentiment. For generations of Cubans, resistance to US pressure became a central pillar of the revolution's legitimacy. For generations of US politicians, Cuba especially became a test case of whether Washington would tolerate an anti-American communist state in its backyard. The failed Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961 locked this antagonism in place. The CIA-backed operation, carried out by Cuban exiles, was intended to topple Castro but instead strengthened him, humiliating Washington while convincing Havana that US regime-change efforts were not hypothetical but real and persistent. After this, any possibility of quick reconciliation vanished. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis transformed bilateral hostility into a global nuclear confrontation. When US reconnaissance discovered Soviet nuclear missile sites in Cuba in October 1962, President Kennedy imposed a naval "quarantine" and demanded their removal. The crisis ended only after a bargain in which the Soviets dismantled the missiles, the US pledged not to invade Cuba, and Washington secretly agreed to remove missiles from Turkey. Although nuclear war was avoided, Cuba's place in US strategic thinking was permanently fixed: it was no longer just an ideological challenge but a possible platform for hostile powers threatening the American mainland. That logic outlived the Cold War. Even after the Soviet Union collapsed, the embargo remained, justified by concerns about authoritarian rule, political repression, and unresolved property claims. Brief openings, including the Obama administration's effort to restore diplomatic ties and expand travel and remittances, showed that coexistence was possible, but they did not erase the embedded structural distrust. The relationship remained vulnerable to reversal, and Trump's return to office has demonstrated just how reversible that thaw was. Bad Relations The recent deterioration in US-Cuba ties is driven by a convergence of economic collapse inside Cuba and a

aimed to squeeze the revolutionary government economically and politically, but in practice it also helped Castro consolidate power by giving Havana a permanent external enemy against which to mobilise nationalist sentiment. For generations of Cubans, resistance to US pressure became a central pillar of the revolution's legitimacy. For generations of US politicians, Cuba especially became a test case of whether Washington would tolerate an anti-American communist state in its backyard. The failed Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961 locked this antagonism in place. The CIA-backed operation, carried out by Cuban exiles, was intended to topple Castro but instead strengthened him, humiliating Washington while convincing Havana that US regime-change efforts were not hypothetical but real and persistent. After this, any possibility of quick reconciliation vanished. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis transformed bilateral hostility into a global nuclear confrontation. When US reconnaissance discovered Soviet nuclear missile sites in Cuba in October 1962, President Kennedy imposed a naval "quarantine" and demanded their removal. The crisis ended only after a bargain in which the Soviets dismantled the missiles, the US pledged not to invade Cuba, and Washington secretly agreed to remove missiles from Turkey. Although nuclear war was avoided, Cuba's place in US strategic thinking was permanently fixed: it was no longer just an ideological challenge but a possible platform for hostile powers threatening the American mainland. That logic outlived the Cold War. Even after the Soviet Union collapsed, the embargo remained, justified by concerns about authoritarian rule, political repression, and unresolved property claims. Brief openings, including the Obama administration's effort to restore diplomatic ties and expand travel and remittances, showed that coexistence was possible, but they did not erase the embedded structural distrust. The relationship remained vulnerable to reversal, and Trump's return to office has demonstrated just how reversible that thaw was. Bad Relations The recent deterioration in US-Cuba ties is driven by a convergence of economic collapse inside Cuba and a

aimed to squeeze the revolutionary government economically and politically, but in practice it also helped Castro consolidate power by giving Havana a permanent external enemy against which to mobilise nationalist sentiment. For generations of Cubans, resistance to US pressure became a central pillar of the revolution's legitimacy. For generations of US politicians, Cuba especially became a test case of whether Washington would tolerate an anti-American communist state in its backyard. The failed Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961 locked this antagonism in place. The CIA-backed operation, carried out by Cuban exiles, was intended to topple Castro but instead strengthened him, humiliating Washington while convincing Havana that US regime-change efforts were not hypothetical but real and persistent. After this, any possibility of quick reconciliation vanished. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis transformed bilateral hostility into a global nuclear confrontation. When US reconnaissance discovered Soviet nuclear missile sites in Cuba in October 1962, President Kennedy imposed a naval "quarantine" and demanded their removal. The crisis ended only after a bargain in which the Soviets dismantled the missiles, the US pledged not to invade Cuba, and Washington secretly agreed to remove missiles from Turkey. Although nuclear war was avoided, Cuba's place in US strategic thinking was permanently fixed: it was no longer just an ideological challenge but a possible platform for hostile powers threatening the American mainland. That logic outlived the Cold War. Even after the Soviet Union collapsed, the embargo remained, justified by concerns about authoritarian rule, political repression, and unresolved property claims. Brief openings, including the Obama administration's effort to restore diplomatic ties and expand travel and remittances, showed that coexistence was possible, but they did not erase the embedded structural distrust. The relationship remained vulnerable to reversal, and Trump's return to office has demonstrated just how reversible that thaw was. Bad Relations The recent deterioration in US-Cuba ties is driven by a convergence of economic collapse inside Cuba and a

aimed to squeeze the revolutionary government economically and politically, but in practice it also helped Castro consolidate power by giving Havana a permanent external enemy against which to mobilise nationalist sentiment. For generations of Cubans, resistance to US pressure became a central pillar of the revolution's legitimacy. For generations of US politicians, Cuba especially became a test case of whether Washington would tolerate an anti-American communist state in its backyard. The failed Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961 locked this antagonism in place. The CIA-backed operation, carried out by Cuban exiles, was intended to topple Castro but instead strengthened him, humiliating Washington while convincing Havana that US regime-change efforts were not hypothetical but real and persistent. After this, any possibility of quick reconciliation vanished. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis transformed bilateral hostility into a global nuclear confrontation. When US reconnaissance discovered Soviet nuclear missile sites in Cuba in October 1962, President Kennedy imposed a naval "quarantine" and demanded their removal. The crisis ended only after a bargain in which the Soviets dismantled the missiles, the US pledged not to invade Cuba, and Washington secretly agreed to remove missiles from Turkey. Although nuclear war was avoided, Cuba's place in US strategic thinking was permanently fixed: it was no longer just an ideological challenge but a possible platform for hostile powers threatening the American mainland. That logic outlived the Cold War. Even after the Soviet Union collapsed, the embargo remained, justified by concerns about authoritarian rule, political repression, and unresolved property claims. Brief openings, including the Obama administration's effort to restore diplomatic ties and expand travel and remittances, showed that coexistence was possible, but they did not erase the embedded structural distrust. The relationship remained vulnerable to reversal, and Trump's return to office has demonstrated just how reversible that thaw was. Bad Relations The recent deterioration in US-Cuba ties is driven by a convergence of economic collapse inside Cuba and a

aimed to squeeze the revolutionary government economically and politically, but in practice it also helped Castro consolidate power by giving Havana a permanent external enemy against which to mobilise nationalist sentiment. For generations of Cubans, resistance to US pressure became a central pillar of the revolution's legitimacy. For generations of US politicians, Cuba especially became a test case of whether Washington would tolerate an anti-American communist state in its backyard. The failed Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961 locked this antagonism in place. The CIA-backed operation, carried out by Cuban exiles, was intended to topple Castro but instead strengthened him, humiliating Washington while convincing Havana that US regime-change efforts were not hypothetical but real and persistent. After this, any possibility of quick reconciliation vanished. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis transformed bilateral hostility into a global nuclear confrontation. When US reconnaissance discovered Soviet nuclear missile sites in Cuba in October 1962, President Kennedy imposed a naval "quarantine" and demanded their removal. The crisis ended only after a bargain in which the Soviets dismantled the missiles, the US pledged not to invade Cuba, and Washington secretly agreed to remove missiles from Turkey. Although nuclear war was avoided, Cuba's place in US strategic thinking was permanently fixed: it was no longer just an ideological challenge but a possible platform for hostile powers threatening the American mainland. That logic outlived the Cold War. Even after the Soviet Union collapsed, the embargo remained, justified by concerns about authoritarian rule, political repression, and unresolved property claims. Brief openings, including the Obama administration's effort to restore diplomatic ties and expand travel and remittances, showed that coexistence was possible, but they did not erase the embedded structural distrust. The relationship remained vulnerable to reversal, and Trump's return to office has demonstrated just how reversible that thaw was. Bad Relations The recent deterioration in US-Cuba ties is driven by a convergence of economic collapse inside Cuba and a

aimed to squeeze the revolutionary government economically and politically, but in practice it also helped Castro consolidate power by giving Havana a permanent external enemy against which to mobilise nationalist sentiment. For generations of Cubans, resistance to US pressure became a central pillar of the revolution's legitimacy. For generations of US politicians, Cuba especially became a test case of whether Washington would tolerate an anti-American communist state in its backyard. The failed Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961 locked this antagonism in place. The CIA-backed operation, carried out by Cuban exiles, was intended to topple Castro but instead strengthened him, humiliating Washington while convincing Havana that US regime-change efforts were not hypothetical but real and persistent. After this, any possibility of quick reconciliation vanished. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis transformed bilateral hostility into a global nuclear confrontation. When US reconnaissance discovered Soviet nuclear missile sites in Cuba in October 1962, President Kennedy imposed a naval "quarantine" and demanded their removal. The crisis ended only after a bargain in which the Soviets dismantled the missiles, the US pledged not to invade Cuba, and Washington secretly agreed to remove missiles from Turkey. Although nuclear war was avoided, Cuba's place in US strategic thinking was permanently fixed: it was no longer just an ideological challenge but a possible platform for hostile powers threatening the American mainland. That logic outlived the Cold War. Even after the Soviet Union collapsed, the embargo remained, justified by concerns about authoritarian rule, political repression, and unresolved property claims. Brief openings, including the Obama administration's effort to restore diplomatic ties and expand travel and remittances, showed that coexistence was possible, but they did not erase the embedded structural distrust. The relationship remained vulnerable to reversal, and Trump's return to office has demonstrated just how reversible that thaw was. Bad Relations The recent deterioration in US-Cuba ties is driven by a convergence of economic collapse inside Cuba and a

aimed to squeeze the revolutionary government economically and politically, but in practice it also helped Castro consolidate power by giving Havana a permanent external enemy against which to mobilise nationalist sentiment. For generations of Cubans, resistance to US pressure became a central pillar of the revolution's legitimacy. For generations of US politicians, Cuba especially became a test case of whether Washington would tolerate an anti-American communist state in its backyard. The failed Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961 locked this antagonism in place. The CIA-backed operation, carried out by Cuban exiles, was intended to topple Castro but instead strengthened him, humiliating Washington while convincing Havana that US regime-change efforts were not hypothetical but real and persistent. After this, any possibility of quick reconciliation vanished. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis transformed bilateral hostility into a global nuclear confrontation. When US reconnaissance discovered Soviet nuclear missile sites in Cuba in October 1962, President Kennedy imposed a naval "quarantine" and demanded their removal. The crisis ended only after a bargain in which the Soviets dismantled the missiles, the US pledged not to invade Cuba, and Washington secretly agreed to remove missiles from Turkey. Although nuclear war was avoided, Cuba's place in US strategic thinking was permanently fixed: it was no longer just an ideological challenge but a possible platform for hostile powers threatening the American mainland. That logic outlived the Cold War. Even after the Soviet Union collapsed, the embargo remained, justified by concerns about authoritarian rule, political repression, and unresolved property claims. Brief openings, including the Obama administration's effort to restore diplomatic ties and expand travel and remittances, showed that coexistence was possible, but they did not erase the embedded structural distrust. The relationship remained vulnerable to reversal, and Trump's return to office has demonstrated just how reversible that thaw was. Bad Relations The recent deterioration in US-Cuba ties is driven by a convergence of economic collapse inside Cuba and a



more aggressive US policy stance. Cuba is facing an acute humanitarian crisis and rising political anxiety owing to shortages of fuel, electricity, food, and hard currency, conditions that have intensified human suffering. The tightened US oil restrictions have led to unprecedented blackouts and fuel shortages, worsening an already fragile economy and feeding a sense of national emergency. In parallel, the Trump administration has chosen the crisis as an opportunity to intensify pressure. A new executive order in early May targeted

individuals and entities in Cuba's energy, defence, financial, and security sectors, as well as those accused of corruption or human-rights abuses. Trump also threatened tariffs on goods imported into the US from countries supplying oil to Cuba, a move intended to choke off lifelines and increase Havana's isolation. That approach reflects a clear strategic calculation: if Cuba is already economically weakened, additional pressure may raise the cost of regime survival and accelerate internal fracture. The administration's

argument is that past engagement failed, sanctions relief only prolonged authoritarian rule, and a sharper use of economic leverage is now justified. Rubio's comments have crystallised this posture. He has said that the US would prefer a negotiated settlement, but that chances are low given the nature of the Cuban government. This signals that diplomacy is no longer the Trump administration's operating assumption; it is a fallback option that would only be entertained if Havana first makes major concessions.

Security Fears and the Logic of Escalation The latest crisis is not only about sanctions. It is also being framed through a security lens that makes compromise harder and increases the risk of miscalculation. US officials have cited intelligence suggesting Cuba possesses around 300 drones and may be considering potential attacks on nearby US targets

such as Guantánamo Bay, Key West, and naval vessels. Reports have also referred to the alleged presence of Iranian military advisers in Havana, a claim that strengthens the administration's effort to place Cuba within a wider axis of US adversaries. Whether this threat perception is accurate or not, its political effect is already evident. By portraying Cuba as a national security threat linked to Russia, China, and Iran, the Trump administration shifts the debate away from the morality of the embargo towards the language of deterrence, pre-emption, and homeland defence. That rhetorical shift matters because it lowers the political threshold for extraordinary measures. The public signalling has been equally striking. The BBC reported that US military aircraft near Cuba were visibly tracked with transponders left on, which experts interpreted as a deliberate.

## NANDINI TEXCOM (INDIA) LIMITED

CIN: L65910GJ1994PLC021165

Reg. Office: B-304, International Commerce Center, Near Kadiwala School, Ring Road, Surat-395002. Tel:0261-4004596; Email: nandinitem.com; website: https://nandinitem.com

### EXTRACT OF STATEMENT OF STANDALONE AUDITED FINANCIAL RESULTS FOR THE QUARTER AND YEAR ENDED 31ST MARCH, 2026

PARTICULARS	QUARTER ENDED		YEAR ENDED	
	31/03/2026	31/03/2025	31/03/2026	31/03/2025
	Audited	Audited	Audited	Audited
1. Total Income from Operations	2,004.70	1,486.24	6,194.26	4,852.31
2. Net Profit/(Loss) for the period before tax	1.88	(11.27)	82.85	(32.61)
3. Net Profit/(Loss) for the period after tax	(10.33)	(11.27)	70.65	(32.00)
4. Total Comprehensive Income for the Period	-	-	-	-
5. Equity Share capital	500.01	500.01	500.01	500.01
6. Reserve excluding Revaluation Reserve				
7. Earnings Per Share (of Rs. 10/- each)				
(for continuing and discontinued operations):				
1. Basic	(0.21)	(0.23)	1.41	(0.64)
2. Diluted	(0.21)	(0.23)	1.41	(0.64)

Note: The above is an extract of the detailed format of Quarterly and Yearly Financial Results filed with the Stock Exchange under Regulation 33 of the SEBI (LODR) Regulations, 2015. The full format of the said Financial Results is available on the Stock Exchange website https://www.msei.in/ and Company's website at https://nandinitem.com



FOR, NANDINI TEXCOM (INDIA) LIMITED  
SD/-  
ASHOKKUMAR TEKRIWAL  
Managing Director  
DIN : 00086179

Place : Surat  
Date : 30th May, 2026



## SHRIRAM ASSET RECONSTRUCTION PRIVATE LIMITED (SARC)

(Acting in its' capacity as Trustee of various SARPL Trusts)

Regd. Office: Shriram House, No.4, Burkit Road, T. Nagar, Chennai - 600017. Corporate Office: Unit No. FF-A-05, A Wing, First Floor, Art Guild House, Phoenix Market City, LBS Marg, Kurla (West), Mumbai-400070. Phone No-1800 102 4345; contact@truhomefinance.in

### PUBLIC NOTICE: E-AUCTION-CUM-SALE NOTICE OF IMMOVABLE PROPERTY/IES

E-Auction for Sale of Immovable Assets under the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 read with provision to Rule 6.8 (6) and 9 of the Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002 as per Appendix-IV-A

Notice is hereby given to the public in general and in particular to the Borrower/s and Guarantor/s that the below described immovable properties mortgaged/ charged to secured creditor, now Shriram Asset Reconstruction Private Limited, acting in capacity as Trustee of various SARPL Trust (pursuant to assignment of financial assets vide registered Assignment Agreements) (hereinafter referred to as "SARPL") under Section (6) of the SARFAEI Act having acquired the financial assets pertaining to various borrowers including the borrowers mentioned herein below together with the underlying security interest created thereof along with all the rights, title and interest thereupon from Original Lender/Assignor/Truhome Finance Limited (Earlier known as Shriram Housing Finance Limited), the Physical Possession of which has been taken by the Authorized Officer of Original Lender/Assignor/Truhome Finance Limited (Earlier known as Shriram Asset Reconstruction Private Limited (SARC)), viz. secured creditor in capacity of Trustee of SARC-Trust-5, the assignee of the loan sanction and disbursed by Assignor Truhome Finance Limited (Earlier known as Shriram Housing Finance Limited), will be sold on "As is where is", "As is what is" and "Whatever there is" as per below mentioned auction schedule for recovery of the outstanding amount together with further interest, charges, cost, expenses etc. thereon to SARPL viz. secured creditor from the Borrowers & Guarantors, as mentioned in the table as per Rules 6.8, & 9 Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002.

Details of Borrowers and Guarantors, amount due, Short Description of the immovable property/ies and encumbrances, known thereon, if any, reserve price, earnest money deposit Increment Bid, Auction date and date of Inspection are also given as under:

Loan Account No, Trust Name & Name of Assignor/Original Lender	Name of Borrowers/Co-Borrowers/Guarantors/Mortgagors	Date & Amount of 13(2) Demand Notice	Reserve Price (Rs.) & Bid Increment	Date & Time of Auction	Contact Person Details - (AO and Disposal team)
SHLHJMNG0000184 Under Trust account No-SARC - TRUST-5 with Truhome Finance Limited	1).Kambariya Ravikumar Naranbhai, 2).Kambariya Shantabhan Naranbhai,	Rs.14,66,557/- (Rupees Fourteen Lakh Sixty Six Thousand Five Hundred Fifty Seven Only) as on 07/02/2025 under reference of loan account no. SHLHJMNG0000184	Rs. 14,96,105/- (Rupees Fourteen lakh ninety six thousand one hundred five only); Bid Increment: Rs 14,961/-  Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) (Rs.) Rs. 1,49,610/-	03 JULY 2026  Auction Time: 12.30 p.m. to 01.30 p.m.	Ashfaq Patka 9819415477 Sunil Manekar 899344897 Akshay Gupta 8963562737 Ajay Zanzot 9823909990 Property Inspection Date: 2.07.2026 at 12.00 to 3.00 p.m.
Date of Possession & Type	Encumbrances known				
22nd November 2025 and Physical Possession	Not known		Last date for submission of EMD : 02.07.2026, at 10.00 a.m. to 05.00 p.m.		

Description of Property  
In Jamnagar City, on Lalpur Highway outside the area of Jamnagar Municipal Corporation at Village : Dared Originally the land of R.S.No.1/paiki/3 admeasuring 4856.00 Sq.Mtrs. Jamnagar area development Authority have sanctioned the lay-out plan and collector-Jamnagar have converted into non-agriculture land and as per layout plan this land divided into 1 to 24 residential plots known as "Sardar Nagar-3" in Sardar Nagar-3, Plot No.13 was sub plotted with the approval of Jamnagar area development Authority and divided into 3 sub-plots i.e. 13/A to 13/C. Out of these sub-plots, sub plot no. 13/A admeasuring plot area 55.36 Sq.Mtrs and construction area 48.91 Sq.Mtrs bearing City Survey no.NA.1/Paiki 3/13 in Sheet No.NA.99 of Ward Dared. Boundaries of the property (As per documents):- East :- Plot No.14, West :- Sub Plot No.13/B, North :- 7.50 wide Road, South :- Land bearing R.S.No.1/paiki 3 and Dared Village property

- For detailed Terms and conditions of the sale, bid form, & others may also visit website of https://www.bankeuctions.com of our auction agency C1 India Pvt. Ltd. Plot No. 68, 3rd Floor, Sector-44, Gurugram, Haryana- 122003. For any assistance, You may write email to on Email id: tm@c1india.com or our business partner M/s Truhome Finance Limited at the given contact numbers given in the table.
  - The intending bidders have to submit their EMD amount to be deposited by way of DD in the name of SARC-TRUST-5 and RTGS/NEFT in SARC-TRUST 5; Bank Name: ICICI Bank Limited; Branch Address: Mumbai - Kamani Kurla West; Bank Account Number:196205004628; IFCL Code- ICICI0001962.
- STATUTORY 15 DAYS SALE NOTICE UNDER RULE 8 (6) OF THE SARFAESI ACT, 2002  
The borrower/mortgagors/ guarantors are hereby notified to pay the sum as mentioned above along with up to date interest and ancillary expenses before the date of e-Auction, failing which the property will be auctioned/ sold and balance dues, if any, will be recovered with interest and cost.

Place : Jamnagar  
Date : 01-06-2026

SD/- Authorised Officer- (Shriram Asset Reconstruction Private Limited)  
Acting in its' capacity as Trustee of various SARPL Trusts

## POSSESSION NOTICE



Regd. Office: ICICI Bank Limited, ICICI Bank Tower, Near Chakli Circle, Old Padra Road, Vadodara, Gujarat. Pin- 390 007  
Corporate Office: ICICI Bank Towers, Bandra- Kurla Complex, Bandra (E), Mumbai - 400 051".

APPENDIX -IV  
[Rule 8 (1)]

PHYSICAL POSSESSION NOTICE  
(For Immovable Property)

Whereas,

The undersigned being the authorized officer of the ICICI Bank Limited under the Securitization and Reconstruction of the Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (54 of 2002) ("Act") and in exercise of powers conferred under section 13(12) read with rule 3 of the Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002 ("Rules") issued demand notice dated October 17, 2025 calling upon the borrower M/s Soriso Paradise ("Borrower/ Firm"), Mr. Hari Agarwal, Mrs. Sunitadevi Hari Agarwal, Mr. Ankur Hari Agarwal, Ms. Nivika Ankur Agarwal, Mr. Mithilesh Pathak, Mrs. Riti Pathak, Mrs. Ankita Abhishek Dholawala, Mr. Jayprakash Pathak ("Guarantors/ Mortgagors"), to repay the amount mentioned in the demand notice being ₹ 2,07,18,248.00 (Rupees Two Crore Seven Lakh Eighteen Thousand Two Hundred Forty Eight only) being the amount due as on as on October 03, 2025 with further interest and incidental expenses, costs towards the ICICI Bank Credit Facilities, together with further interest and other charges thereon with effect from October 04, 2025 within 60 days from the date of receipt of the said notice.

The Borrower having failed to repay the amount, notice is hereby given to the Borrower/ Guarantors/ Mortgagors and the public in general that the undersigned has taken possession of the property described herein below in exercise of powers conferred on him/her under sub-section 4 of Section 13 of the Act read with rule 8 of the Security Interest Enforcement Rules, 2002 on this 28th day of May 2026.

The Borrower, Mortgagors and Guarantors in particular and the public in general are hereby cautioned not to deal with the property and any dealings with the property will be subject to the charge of ICICI Bank Limited for an amount ₹ 2,17,86,907.99 (Rupees Two Crore Seventeen Lakh Eighty Six Thousand Nine Hundred Seven and Ninety Nine Paise only) towards the ICICI Bank Credit Facilities as on May 02, 2026 and contractual interest thereon along with other charges with effect from May 03, 2026.

The borrower's attention is invited to provisions of sub-section (8) of Section 13 of the Act, in respect of time available, to redeem the secured assets.

A) Short particulars of immovable property exclusively mortgaged with the Bank by Mrs. Ankita Abhishek Dholawala:

Flat No. C-1302 admeasuring about 915 sq. fts. i.e. 85.03 sq. mtrs. built-up area on 13th floor of Building No. C of Vama Apex together with undivided proportionate land underneath the said building constructed on the Final Plot No. 100 admeasuring about 5611 sq. mts. Of Town Planning Scheme No. 37 (Althan-South) situated on the said land bearing Revenue Survey No. 179/1 i.e. Block No. 238 of Village Althan Taluka City District Surat Gujarat- 395 017 and bounded is below:

East by: PASSAGE  
West by: OS  
North by: OS  
South by: FLAT NO. 1301

together with all buildings and structures thereon, rights, fixtures, fittings and all plant and machinery attached to the earth or permanently fastened to anything attached to the earth, both present and future.

Date: June 01, 2026  
Place: Gujarat

SD/-  
(Authorised Officer)  
ICICI Bank Limited

