



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

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 6953 OF 2025
IN
COMPANY PETITION NO. 385 OF 2002

Grand View Estates Pvt Ltd

...Applicant

Versus

Board For Industrial And Financial
Reconstruction and Others

...Respondent

Mr. Mohit Khanna, Mr. Pranav Narsaria, Mr. Tejas Popat i/b mr. Pravin Patil for Respondent Nos. 4 and 5.

Mr. Amir Arsiwala for Respondent No. 2.

Mr. Yash Jariwala for Respondent No. 3.

Mr. Shankh Sengupta, Mr. Siddharth Ranade, Ms. Nishi bhankharia, Mr. Vedant Kumar, Mr. Gaurav Jain, Ms. Neeraja Barve i/b M/s. Trilegal for Applicant.

Mr. Ranjeev Carvalho, Ms. Apurva Thipsay for OL.

Mr. Satyajit Roul, OL present.

CORAM : SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : FEBRUARY 27, 2026

P. C. :

1. Praecipe has been moved by the Official Liquidator for expunging certain observations made by this Court in Paragraph Nos. 78, 79 and 80 of the judgment dated 23rd February, 2026 passed by this Court.

2. Mr. Carvalho, learned counsel appearing for Official Liquidator

would, at the outset, tender unconditional apology to the Court and would submit that despite great care being taken while preparing the written submissions and placing the material before this Court, the pay-out was not mentioned which was unintentional and inadvertent error on the part of Official Liquidator. He submits that the OL is conscious of the fact that it is extension of the Court and all efforts were made to place all material available with the Official liquidator during the hearing of the Interim Application. He would submit that the observations of this Court in Paragraph Nos. 78, 79 and 80 would have an adverse impact on the Official Liquidator and requests the same to be expunged. He submits that the Official Liquidator has accepted the decision and does not intend to challenge the same. He has taken this Court through the observations in Paragraph Nos. 78, 79 and 80 of the judgment and portions impacting the OL. He further points out that the reference to OLR is wrongly mentioned as OLR 21 of 2021 instead of 12 of 2021.

3. Mr. Khanna would fairly not oppose expunging of remarks sought by the Official Liquidator. He submits that the appearance has been wrongly noted of the counsels appearing for Respondent Nos. 4 and 5.

4. I have gone through the relevant paragraphs of the judgment.

5. Considering the submissions made, this Court is of opinion that

the observations as regards the Official Liquidator can be expunged.

6. In view thereof, in the last sentence of Paragraph No. 78, the words starting from **“and non-mentioning of the declaration of dividend”** till the end of sentence stands expunged. In the second last sentence of paragraph no. 79, the word **“convenient”** stands expunged and in paragraph 80 in the second sentence, the reference to the OL i.e. the words **“and the OL”** stand expunged.

7. Judgment to be accordingly modified.

[SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.]