ITEM NO.35 COURT NO.1 SECTION XIV

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). 33135/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 31-08-2026 in EX.APPL.(OS) No. 3763/2022 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

YES BANK LIMITED Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

DAIICHI SANKYO COMPANY LIMITED & ORS. Respondent(s)

(IA No. 282710/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No. 289320/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 34013/2026 (XIV)
(IA No. 295229/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS /ANNEXURES)

Date : 29-09-2026 These matters were 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. Shyam Divan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ritin Rai, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Shally Bhasin, Adv.
Mr. Prateek Yadav, Adv.
Ms. Jyotsna Punshi, Adv.
Ms. Sonsie Khatri, Adv.
Mr. Adith Deshmukh, Adv.
Mr. Apoorva Nangia, Adv.
Mr. S. S. Shroff, AOR

Mr. Shyam Divan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Malak Manish Bhatt, AOR
Ms. Samridhi, Adv.
Mr. Adith Deshmukh, Adv.
Ms. Tashi Saraf, Adv.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by NITIN MEHTA
Date: 2026.09.29 16:54:38 IST
Reason:

Respondent(s) :Mr. Aditya Dewan, Adv.
Ms. Himangi Kapoor, Adv.
Mr. Naman Tandon, AOR

Ms. Himangi Kapoor, Adv.
Mr. Naman Tandon, AOR

Mr. Navin Kumar Pahwa, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Singh, Adv.
M/S. K Ashar & Co., AOR

Mr. Amit Rawal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Arvind Datar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Arvind Nigam, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Anand Swarup Pathak, Adv.
Mr. Giriraj Subramanium, Adv.
Mr. Nabik Syam, Adv.
Mr. Pawan Bhushan, Adv.
Ms. Anandita Barman, Adv.
Mr. Shashank Kumar Anand, Adv.
Mr. Chirag Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Sai Srijan Neti, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Krishan Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Jaisal Baath, Adv.
Mr. Kunal Chatterji, AOR
Ms. Bijaharini G, Adv.
Mr. Sushant Bontha, Adv.
Mr. Kunal Chatterji, AOR

Ms. Saman Ahsan, Adv.
Ms. Srijata Majumdar, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Sangwan, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. We have heard learned senior counsel for the parties at a considerable length. The relevant records have also been perused with their able assistance.

2. In sum and substance, it seems to us that the directions to conduct a forensic audit are primarily directed with respect to the transactions between FHL, FHHPL and the judgment debtors. The directions issued by the High Court in paragraph 274 of the impugned judgment regarding the forensic audit *qua* 17 banks, therefore, ought to be read and construed in that context. In other words, these directions pertain to the commercial

transactions/ relationships between the judgment debtors, FHL, FHHPL and the banks. Clauses x and xi of Paragraph 274 of the impugned judgment need not be misconstrued as if there is a direction for a fishing and roving enquiry into the entire affairs of the banks other than their transactions with FHL, FHHPL and the judgment debtors.

3. With this clarification, these Special Leave Petitions stand disposed of, with pending application(s), if any.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
DY. REGISTRAR