

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 564 OF 2025
IN
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.6658 OF 2024
IN
SECOND APPEAL NO.330 OF 2021

Rujuta Mandar Thatte and Anr.

...Petitioners

Versus

Forefront Private Limited and Ors.

...Respondents

Ms. Aditi Naikare, for the Petitioners.

VISHAL
SUBHASH
PAREKAR

Digitally signed by
VISHAL SUBHASH
PAREKAR
Date: 2026.02.02
19:34:18 +0530

CORAM : SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : FEBRUARY 02, 2026

P. C. :

1. Contempt is alleged of the order dated 14th August, 2024 passed in Contempt Petition No.73 of 2024 and undertakings given to this Court in consent terms dated 14th August, 2025 filed in Interim Application No. 6658 of 2024 in Second Appeal No. 330 of 2021.
2. Learned counsel for the Petitioners submits that as per the consent terms, the Respondents had undertaken to pay lumpsum amount of Rs.22,50,000/- as full and final settlement of all the claims, out of which, sum of Rs. 2,50,000/- has been paid whereas post dated

cheques of Rs. 5 lakhs and 15 lakhs have been dishonored.

3. Office noting indicates that the notice issued to Respondent No. 1 is duly served and notice issued to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 have been returned un-served as Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 had gone out of town. The addresses in the cause title shows that the addresses of Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are the same as that of Respondent No. 1 and being the Directors of the company, the staff of the Respondent No. 1 ought to have accepted the service.

4. It is informed by the learned counsel for the Petitioners that Respondents have been served by private notice. The affidavit of service is tendered and taken on record.

5. It appears that the Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are avoiding service. Hence, issue bailable warrant in the sum of Rs. 15,000/- against Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 each, returnable on 4th March, 2026.

[SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.]