

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).28857/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 07-08-2026 in IA No.4053/2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay]

RAJESH MEHTA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

PRASHANT MEHTA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 245415/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

Date : 22-08-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE V. MOHANA

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Devadatt Kamat, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Utsav Trivedi, Adv.
Ms. Manini Roy, Adv.
Ms. Sanjana Rai, Adv.
Mr. Anudatt Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Harsh Pandey, Adv.
M/s. Tas Law, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddhartha Dave, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Shoeb Alam, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Tarun Mehra, Adv.
Mr. Dakshesh Vyas, Adv.
Mr. Dikshat Mehra, Adv.
Mr. Mohnish Bhatia, Adv.
Ms. Minal Chandnani, Adv.
Mr. Vivek Dwivedi, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Jagiasi, Adv.
Mr. Mohd. Naved, Adv.
Mr. Shivendra Singh, AOR
Ms. Aryama Singh Rajput, Adv.

Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Dave, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Shoeb Alam, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. Ankur Saigal, Adv.

Ms. Anushree Kapooria, Adv.
Mr. Naman Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Tarun Mehra, Adv.
Mr. Dakshesh Vyas, Adv.
Mr. Monish Bhatia, Adv.
Mr. Dikshat Mehtra, Adv.
Ms. Minal Chandnani, Adv.
Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR

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

1. The petitioner was a Permanent Trustee of Lilavati Kirtilal Mehta Medical Trust alongwith respondents No. 1 to 3. He has challenged his removal from the post of Permanent Trustee through Suit No.190/2026 by invoking the Original Jurisdiction of the High Court of Bombay. In the said suit, it appears that various interim applications have been moved by both sides, including an application for rejection of the plaint under Order 7 Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Similarly, the petitioner has moved Interim Application No. 4053/2026 seeking *interim* injunction. That application is now listed before the High Court on 27.08.2026 at 3 p.m. Apprehending that the injunction application is not likely to be decided in *lieu* of the multiplicity of interim applications filed by the other side, the petitioner has approached this Court.

2. We have heard learned Senior Counsel for both sides.

3. We are not inclined to interfere with the impugned interim order, especially when the matter is pending consideration before the High Court.

4. Consequently, we dispose of this special leave petition with a request to the High Court to take up the pending applications one-by-one, preferably on day-to-day basis and dispose of the same. The sequence or priority assigned in taking up the pending applications

will be decided by the learned Presiding Judge. In this regard, we clarify that we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

5. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
DY. REGISTRAR