

ITEM NO.37

COURT NO.16

SECTION IX

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 14099/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 06-04-2026 in IA(L) No. 2849/2026 in CA(L)No.39319/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay]

SABOO TOR PRIVATE LIMITED

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

GRASIM INDUSTRIES LIMITED & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 121018/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF I/JUDGMENT, IA No. 122493/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDL.DOCS./FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 04-05-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.V.N. BHATTI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Pachnanda, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Ruby Singh Ahuja, Adv.
Mr. Thomas George, Adv.
Mr. Nitin Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Kritika Sachdeva, Adv.
Ms. Swikriti Singhanian, Adv.
Ms. Megha Dugar, Adv.
Ms. Neeti Nihal, Adv.
Mr. Abhay Aren, Adv.
Ms. Shreya Bansal, Adv.
Ms. Aditi, Adv.
M/S. Karanjawala & Co., AOR

For Respondent(s) Dr. A.M. Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. Rishi Agrawala, Adv.
Ms. Madhavi Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Heard Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, learned Senior Counsel Mr.Gaurav Pachnanda, learned Senior Counsel, appearing for the

petitioner and Dr. A.M. Singhvi, learned Senior Counsel appearing on caveat on behalf of the respondent(s).

2. Mr. Mukul Rohatgi and Mr.Gaurav Pachnanda, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submit that the High Court has allowed the application filed under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Code of Civil Procedure (for short, 'CPC') oblivious of the provisions of Order 11 Rule 5 of the CPC especially since the suit was a commercial suit(s).

3. We have carefully perused the impugned order. We have also been exhaustively taken through the averments in the plaint. We are of the opinion on the facts and circumstances of the present case, the discretion under Order 41 Rule 27 of the CPC has been rightly exercised and all parameters required for admitting the documents have been applied correctly. Hence, we find no good ground to interfere with the impugned order.

4. Needless to say that the impugned order has only allowed the application filed under order 41 Rule 27 of CPC, in the sense that it has permitted the documents to be brought on record as, and its probative value and relevance are to be decided in the course of hearing in the main appeal.

5. Needless to further observe that the main appeal will be heard and decided uninfluenced by any observations made in the impugned order.

6. Mr.Gaurav Pachnanda, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, drawing attention to paragraph 40 of the impugned order (page 49) submits that since the matter

was pending here, the petitioner has not yet filed the additional affidavit dealing with the documents which have now been permitted to be filed by the respondents therein. He prays for a week's time from today to place the additional affidavit.

7. Time for filing the additional affidavit is extended till 11.05.2026.

8. With the above observations, the Special Leave Petitions is disposed of.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(NIRMALA NEGI)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(MANOJ KUMAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)