

Shephali

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3693 OF 2022
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST) NO. 23374 OF 2022
WITH
REVIEW PETITION (ST) NO. 23374 OF 2022

Sitamraju Sree Ramkrishna	...Applicant
<i>In the matter between</i>	
Sitamraju Sree Ramkrishna	...Petitioner
<i>Versus</i>	
Union of India & Ors	...Respondents

Mr Abhishek Venkatraman, *with Viswajit P Deb, i/b Falcon Legal, for the Petitioner.*

Mr Sharan Jagtiani, Senior Advocate, *with Bhushan Shah, Akash Jain & Daksha Kasekar, i/b Mansukhlal Hiralal & Co, for Respondent No. 2-SEBI.*

Mr Melvyn Fernandes, *with Supriya Majumdar & Saurabhsai Ganesan, i/b Vaish Associates, for Respondent No. 4.*

Digitally
signed by
SHEPHALI
SANJAY
MORMARE
Date:
2024.01.12
10:25:07
+0530

CORAM G.S. Patel &
Madhav J Jamdar, JJ.
DATED: 10th January 2024

PC:-

1. We do not see that any case is made out for review. But we will note one additional fact brought to our attention by Mr Jagtiani,

learned Senior Advocate appearing for Security Exchange Board of India (“SEBI”). On the basis of an internal enquiry (whether or not based on the complaint of the Review Petitioner) SEBI has on 11th July 2023 issued an administrative warning to Respondent No 4, Hindustan Unilever Ltd, “HUL”. We are shown a copy of this communication. On our insistence, a copy of this communication is given to the learned Advocate for the Petitioner, and it is also taken on record and marked “X1” for identification with today’s date.

2. In our order of 14th March 2022 of which review is sought, we had inter alia held in paragraphs 6 and 7 that the Petition demanded the taking of evidence. We had also held that the Petition was directed against a private entity HUL and not an instrumentality of the State. We see no cause to depart from those findings. But we do clarify that notwithstanding the order of 14th March 2022 and any observations in that order, it is open to the Petitioner, if so advised, to adopt appropriate civil proceedings in a court of competent jurisdiction against Respondent No 4, Hindustan Unilever Ltd, for all available reliefs including those sought in the Writ Petition itself. As between the Petitioner and Respondent No 4, all contentions are expressly kept open for such civil proceedings.

3. In view of this, the Review Petition and Interim Application both are disposed of.

(Madhav J Jamdar, J)

(G. S. Patel, J)