

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
IN ITS COMMERCIAL DIVISION
INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 34887 OF 2024
IN
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 2007 OF 2025

Grindwell Norton Limited

...Applicant/Plaintiff

Versus

Preetham Reddy & Ors.

...Defendants

WITH
COMMERCIAL IP SUIT (L) NO. 233 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 11706 OF 2024
WITH
LEAVE PETITION (L) NO. 34392 OF 2023
WITH
COURT RECEIVER'S REPORT NO. 50 OF 2024
IN
COMMERCIAL IP SUIT (L) NO. 233 OF 2025

Mr.Hiren Kamod a/w Rohan Lopes & Karan Khiani i/b Rashmi Singh for Plaintiff.
Mr. Deepak Bhalerao, Second Assistant to Court Receiver, Present.

CORAM : ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.

DATE : 24th SEPTEMBER 2025

P.C.

1. The matter is today on board in the backdrop of the order dated 17th September 2025 by which this Court had noted that the defendants had not

denied the factum of having committed contempt of the *ex-parte* interim order dated 18th December 2023 passed by this Court.

2. It was at the request of learned counsel appearing on behalf of the defendants on the previous occasion that the matter was stood over today, since learned counsel had on the previous occasion submitted that he would need time to take instructions from the defendant for the aspect of payment of some costs. The matter was stood over today after specifically recording as follows:

3. Mr. Tyagi, learned counsel appearing (virtually) on behalf of the defendants submits that on instructions from the defendant, who he submits is present with him, the matter be stood over next week. He submits that the defendant shall offer payment of some costs.

3. Mr. Kamod, today submits that after the order dated 17th September 2025 was passed the advocates for the applicant/plaintiff had in fact addressed two e-mails to the defendants advocates. However, the same had not been responded to.

4. It is thus that Mr. Kamod today submits that the defendants have acted in contempt of the order of this Court. Additionally, he points out that the defendants are not present either personally or through advocates. He thus

submits that notice be issued to defendant Nos.1 & 2, requiring their physical presence in Court on the next date.

5. Having heard Mr. Kamod and having perused the previous orders passed, I find merit in the submissions made by Mr. Kamod. Hence issue notice to defendant Nos.1 & 2 whose details are as follows.

1. Mr. Preetham Reddy
#21, Narayana Reddy Industrial Area
Old Madras Road, Doorvaninagar
Bangalore – 560016

2. Salaka Shalini Devi
#21, Narayana Reddy Industrial Area
Old Madras Road, Doorvaninagar
Bangalore – 560016

6. It is made clear that if on the next date respondent Nos.1 & 2 are not present, the Court would ensure their presence by issuing appropriate warrants against them, returnable on **8th October 2025 (HOB)**.

7. It is made clear that if on the next date, the respondents do not appear in person, this Court would be constrained to issueailable warrants to secure their presence.

8. A copy of this order shall be served upon respondent Nos.1 & 2 by the advocates for applicants/plaintiff who shall support the same by way of affidavit.

(ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.)