

jvs

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 177 OF 2022

Uttam Ramdas Mhetre	}	Petitioner
Versus		
The Official Liquidator & Anr.	}	Respondents

WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 18521 OF 2022
IN
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 177 OF 2022

Asset Reconstruction Company	}	
(India) Limited.	}	Applicant
In the matter between		
Uttam Ramdas Mhetre	}	Petitioner
Versus		
The Official Liquidator & Anr.	}	Respondents

WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 18522 OF 2022
IN
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 177 OF 2022

State Bank of India and Anr.	}	Applicant
In the matter between		
Uttam Ramdas Mhetre	}	Petitioner
Versus		
The Official Liquidator & Anr.	}	Respondents

AND
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 18520 OF 2022
IN
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 177 OF 2022

The Official Liquidator	}	Applicant
In the matter between		
Uttam Ramdas Mhetre	}	Petitioner
Versus		
The Official Liquidator & Anr.	}	Respondents

SALUNKE
J V

Digitally signed
by SALUNKE J V
Date: 2023.01.19
10:52:59 +0530

Mr. Yatin Malvankar for the petitioner.

Mr. P. P. Kakade, Government Pleader with
Mr. M. M. Pabale, AGP for State.

Mr. Haris A. Khan i/b. Mr. Ajinkya Kurudkar
for the applicant in IA/18522/2022.

Mr. Santosh Budhwani i/b. Manilal Kher
Ambalal and Co. for the applicant in
IA/18521/2022.

Mr. Ashish Pyasi i/b. Dhir and Dhir
Associates for respondents 1 and 2.

**CORAM: S. V. GANGAPURWALA, Act.CJ.&
SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.**

DATE: JANUARY 17, 2023

P.C.:

Interim Application Nos. 18521 & 18522 of 2022:

- 1.** The learned advocates for the applicants submit that the applicants are the secured creditors of the respondent no. 2. The property of the respondent no. 2 is the subject matter of the PIL petition.
- 2.** The learned advocate for the original petitioner opposes the applications and submits that the applicants are not the necessary parties.
- 3.** The applicants claim to be the secured creditors. The assets of the respondent no. 2 are secured according to the applicants.
- 4.** In view of that, the applicants would be the necessary parties. The applications as such are allowed. The original petitioner shall array the applicants as party respondents.
- 5.** Both the interim applications are disposed of.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)