

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

**INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 7478 OF 2025
IN
EXECUTION APPLICATION (L) NO. 23454 OF 2024**

Palaparthi Sitamahalakshmi Rao

...Plaintiff

V/s.

Zee Entertainment Enterprises Ltd.

...Defendant

Mr. Rohit Jain i/b Jayakar and Partners for the Plaintiff.

Mr. Priyank Kapadia with Mr. Kunal Parekh i/b Dua Associates for the Defendant.

**CORAM : ABHAY AHUJA, J.
DATE : 22nd JANUARY, 2026**

PC. :

1. This Interim Application seeks restoration of the Execution Application that came to be dismissed by a self-operative order of this Court for non removal of office objections and non obtention of the registered number.

2. Mr. Jain, learned Counsel appears for the Applicant and submits that instructions were given to the filing clerk to note down the objections and remove them and number the application and although the Advocates were monitoring the same, however, due to oversight the objections in the Execution Application were not removed. It is submitted that the objections in the Interim Application were removed however, in the Execution Application the same remained to be

removed and therefore, in view of the order dated 18th August, 2025, the Execution Application came to be dismissed for non removal of the office objections. Mr. Jain submits that the non removal is completely unintentional and on account of inadvertence. That the Execution application is seeking the execution of the award dated 28th June, 2023 in the sum of Rs. 7,27,39,185/- along with interest at the rate of 12% per annum. That although the Petition under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 is pending, however, there is no stay on the execution of the award.

3. Mr. Kapadia, learned Counsel appears for the Respondent and raises a formal objection.

4. This Court has in several matters held that inadvertence or oversight by itself is no ground for non compliance of the orders of this Court, however, this Court has also observed that an award holder, who has obtained an award which is not been satisfied cannot be ousted for non compliance of office objections. As also observed in several matters that the parties approaching the Court have to maintain discipline and comply with the orders of the Court and therefore, this Court seeks to balance by imposing costs for non compliance with the orders of this Court resulting in dismissal.

5. Accordingly, subject to payment of costs of Rs. 10,000/- to the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa's Advocate Academy and Research Center within a period of two weeks, the Application is allowed and let the Execution Application as well as the Interim Application be restored to file.
6. Subject to payment of above costs, let objections to the Execution Application be removed within a period of four weeks.
7. The Interim Application accordingly stands allowed and disposed as above.

(ABHAY AHUJA, J.)

NIKITA
YOGESH
GADGIL

Digitally signed by
NIKITA YOGESH
GADGIL
Date: 2026.01.23
10:45:04 +0530