

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
IN ITS COMMERCIAL DIVISION

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 951 OF 2025

IN

COMPANY PETITION NO. 114 OF 2012

Chinmay Nareshkumar Shah

...Applicant

In the matter between.

Etisalat Mauritius Ltd.

...Petitioner

Versus

Etisalat D. B. Telecom Ltd. & Ors.

...Respondents

WITH

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1222 OF 2025

IN

COMPANY PETITION NO. 114 OF 2012

Jignesh Pravinchandra Shah (HUF)

...Applicant

In the matter between.

Etisalat Mauritius Ltd.

...Petitioner

Versus

Etisalat D. B. Telecom Ltd. & Ors.

...Respondents

Ms. Aneesa Cheema a/w Mr. Ritik Sinha i/b Mr. Anuj Jhaveri, for the Applicant.

Mr. Agastya Shreenivasan a/w Ms. Sakshi Sharma i/b Solomon & Co., for the
Official Liquidator.

Mr. Satyajit Roul, for Official Liquidator.

CORAM	:	ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.
DATE	:	13 th NOVEMBER 2025

P.C.

1. The grievance of Ms. Cheema, learned counsel for the Applicants today that though the Official Liquidator had issued a letter on 1st July 2025 calling upon the Applicants to submit necessary documents to enable the Official

Liquidator to readjudicate the claims more particularly set out in the said order, the Official Liquidator has not yet done so.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Official Liquidator submits that the Official Liquidator would have to readjudicate all the claims made by the Applicant.

3. Ms. Cheems opposes this, submitting that the order dated 20th June 2025 was clear and had directed as follows:

"1. Considering the limited controversy involved in the present case as regards the amounts claimed of service tax, electricity charges and interest, it would be appropriate if the Official Liquidator calls upon the Applicant to submit necessary documents so that the claim can be properly adjudicated. Learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant is not averse to the said course.

2. Let the communication be addressed by the office of Official Liquidator to the Applicant setting out the documents required for the adjudication of the claim.

3. Stand over to 11th July 2025."

4. Ms. Cheema submits that the other claims of the Applicants have already been adjudicated, and thus the question of reopening the same would not arise.

5. Learned counsel for the Official Liquidator points out that the Applicants would not be entitled to receive such claims, and it is thus that the Official Liquidator has sought to have all the claims readjudicated.

6. Having heard learned counsel, in my view, the order dated 20th June 2025 is clear and today remains unassailed. Thus, the Official Liquidator is directed to adjudicate upon the claims of the Applicant as more particularly encapsulated in the said order.

7. The Official Liquidator is at liberty to file an appropriate report in the event the Official Liquidator is of view that the Applicant would not be entitled to any of such claims.

8. The Interim Application is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

[ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.]