

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

CHAMBER ORDER NO. 484 OF 2025
IN
EXECUTION APPLICATION (L) NO. 111 OF 2019

Gati Limited ..Applicant

Versus

Union of India ..Respondent

Mr. Sagar Kshirsagar i/b. Mr. Dushyant S. Pagare, Advocates, for the Applicant

Mr. Gautam Modanwal i/b. Mr. T. J. Pandian, Advocates, for the Respondent

CORAM : RAJESH S. PATIL, J.

DATE : 22.04.2026

P. C.

1. This matter is moved for further extension of time of two weeks to remove office objections by learned Counsel for the Applicant.

2. Mr. Modanwal, learned Counsel for the Respondent – Union, has strongly opposed the request made by learned Counsel for the Applicant. He has referred to the provisions of O. VIII, Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (for short “**CPC**”) and also relied on the Judgment of the Delhi High Court in the case of *M/s. Formosa Plastics Corporation, USA vs. Ashok K. Chauhan & ors.* delivered on 20.09.2011.

3. I have heard learned Counsel for both the sides.
4. First of all, the citation relied upon by learned Counsel for the Respondent seems to be not from any recognized neither there is watermark of any Court. He has referred to paragraph 11 which refers to the provisions of O. VIII, Rule 1 of the CPC.
5. In the present proceeding, the Applicants are the Decree Holders of an Arbitral Award and their Execution Application was dismissed for non-removal of office objections by a conditional order passed by the Prothonotary & Senior Master of this Court.
6. By the Chamber Order, the Applicant sought to set aside the Order passed by the Prothonotary & Senior Master of this Court and also to grant further time to remove office objections. On 23.03.2026, after hearing both the parties, the Chamber Order was allowed by this Court and time of four weeks was granted to the Applicant to remove office objections.
7. Today, the matter has been moved by a praecipe seeking to grant further time to remove office objections. As per the requisition slip, certain objections were raised in the Execution Application which are required to be complied, by removing office objections. It is normal, it takes time for any Advocate for the Plaintiff/Petitioner to remove office objections. From the record, it appears that the Execution Application

was filed by M/s. Kanga & Co.. Thereafter, the present Advocate has come on record for the Applicant. I had already allowed the Applicant's Application by setting aside the Order passed by the Prothonotary & Senior Master of this Court and granted four weeks time to the Applicant to remove office objections. As the Advocate for the Applicant was not able to remove the office objections, he has sought further extension of time to remove office objections. As I showed my inclination to grant time, the Counsel for Railways has further raised his objection. By harping upon the Judgment of which according to him, is of Delhi High Court.

8. I am satisfied with the reason given by learned Counsel for the Applicant.

(RAJESH S. PATIL, J.)