

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.50 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.3710 OF 2023
WITH
SHOW CAUSE NOTICE (WRIT PETITION) NO.9 OF 2024**

JSW Steel Limited

... Petitioner

Versus

R. K. Mishra

... Respondent

**Mr. Rafique Dada, Senior Advocate a/w. Mr. Prakash Shah,
Senior Advocate, Mr. Jas Sanghavi and Mr. Vikas
Poojary i/b PDS Legal, for Petitioners.**

**Mr. Anil Singh, ASG a/w. Mr. Jitendra Mishra, Mr. Ashutosh
Mishra, Mr. Rupesh Dubey and Mr. Vikas K. Salgia, for
Respondent.**

**CORAM : M. S. Sonak &
Jitendra Jain, JJ.**

DATED : 6 August 2025

PC:-

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. In these contempt petitions, notices for contempt were issued to the respondents. After the matter was argued for some time, this Court felt that this was a matter which could be sorted out by the parties. Accordingly, the parties were urged to sit and explore the possibility of a resolution instead of precipitating the issues in these contempt petitions.

3. Now we are happy to record that the parties have, to a great extent, sorted out the matter based on documents on record.

4. Mr. Singh, the Additional Solicitor General of India submits that the respondents had no intention of disobeying the orders of this Court. He submits that today, in Contempt Petition No.50 of 2025 the respondents handed over balance scrips valued at Rs.57,91,20,768/- and in the second Contempt Petition (L) No.23888 of 2024, the respondents had handed over scrips valued at Rs.23,70,76,457/-. He pointed out that this was against the petitioner's claim of Rs.57,95,92,973/- and Rs.23,81,48,625/-

5. Mr. Rafique Dada, learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner in both contempt petitions acknowledges receipt of scrips. He states that although there is balance of Rs.4.72 lakhs and Rs.10.72 lakhs, he has instructions not to press these contempt petitions and accept these scrips in full and final settlement of the controversies which are the subject matter of these petitions.

6. Now that the above scrips are already been offered and accepted, we do not think that we should pursue these contempt petitions any further.

7. We accept Mr. Singh's statement made on instructions that respondents never had any intention of disobeying the orders of the Court.

8. Accordingly, we discharge Contempt Notices, close these contempt proceedings and dispose of both these petitions.

9. Notices were issued based on a *prima facie* opinion that we had formed and issuance of such notices was not intended to reflect any final opinion on the conduct of any of the respondents.

10. In any event, now these notices are discharged and contempt petitions are also disposed of.

(Jitendra Jain, J)

(M. S. Sonak, J)