

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

INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 673 OF 2026
IN
COMMERCIAL IP SUIT (L) NO. 32380 OF 2025

Skechers South Asia Pvt. Ltd. And Ors.

...Applicants/
Plaintiffs

Versus

Manmeet Singh trading as Sahib Footwear And Ors. ...Defendants

*Mr. Hiren Kamod a/w Ms. Smriti Yadav, Mr. Shubham Shende, Mr. Shubham Singh i/b Khaitan & Co., for the Applicants/Plaintiff.
Mr. Deepak S. Bhalerao, Second Assistant to Court Receiver.*

CORAM : SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : January 14, 2026

P. C. :

1. The Interim Application has been preferred under Order XXXIX Rule 2A of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for breach and contempt of the ex-parte order dated 10th October, 2025 passed by this Court in the Interim Application (L) No. 32420 of 2025.
2. Mr. Kamod, learned counsel for the Plaintiff has taken this Court through the ex parte ad-interim order dated 10th October, 2025 and the order dated 8th December, 2025 passed in Interim Application (L) No.

32420 of 2025. He submits that though the ex parte ad-interim order was passed on 10th October, 2025 in respect of Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 9, the order could not be executed and points out the conduct of Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 9 which was recorded in the order of 8th December, 2025. He submits that the Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 9 had obstructed the execution of the order and has manhandled the Additional Special Receiver.

3. He points out to the Court Receiver's report dated 16th October, 2025, in respect of execution of the ex parte order dated 10th October, 2025. He submits that the Additional Special Receiver visited the premises of the Defendants for execution of the order when the market association President forcibly halted the execution proceedings and refused to allow further compliance. He submits that the Defendants also refused to sign the official documents and attendance sheet prepared on spot which led to passing of the order of 8th December, 2025. He submits that during the execution of the order of 16th October, 2025, in so far as the Defendant No. 1 premises is concerned, though the Additional Special Receiver visited the premises along with police personnel, the Defendant No. 1 gathered a mob and with the help of the market association shut down all shops in the vicinity.

4. He submits that the Defendant No. 9 interfered with the

execution of the ex parte order by adopting a similar course and the Defendant No. 1 did not allow the Additional Special Receiver to seize the products. He submits that the Defendant No. 9 also tried to strangle the Additional Special Receiver.

5. He further points out that after the order of 8th December, 2025, the order was sought to be executed on 20th December, 2025. He submits that on 20th December, 2025, Defendant No. 1 abused the Court Receiver and when the Additional Special Receiver attempted to serve the copies of the plaint in order to explain him the scope and purpose of the order, the Defendant No. 1 pushed the Additional Special Receiver outside the premises and abused him. He would further point out the report of Additional Special Receiver stating that the Defendant No. 1 punched the Additional Special Receiver on his chest and called for men from the adjacent shops, abused and threatened the Additional Special Receiver. He would further point out that the Advocate for the Plaintiff was pushed from the premises of the Defendant No. 1 and in the scuffle, the Additional Special Receiver injured his little finger and the back of the neck due to assault by the Defendant No. 1.

6. He would further submit that in so far as the Defendant No. 9 is concerned when the Additional Special Receiver went to execute the order, the Additional Special Receiver was threatened and abused. He

submits that in order to avoid the execution of the ex parte ad-interim order, the Defendant No. 9 closed the shop.

7. Mr. Kamod would further submit that though the Defendant No. 3 initially attempted to settle the matter with the Plaintiff, the matter was not settled. He submits that the Plaintiff had hired an investigator in order to ascertain whether the Defendant No. 3 is continuing with the infringing activities and points out to the investigation report which showed that the Defendant No. 3 is continuing with the infringing activity and has also opened 5 new stores selling the counterfeit products of the Plaintiff.

8. He submits that the orders of this Court are being blatantly violated by the Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 9 and in addition the conduct of the Defendants amounts to criminal act of intimidation to Additional Special Receiver who are appointed to facilitate the execution of the order and to assist the Court Receiver in implementing the orders of this Court.

9. The submissions canvassed by Mr. Kamod are substantiated by the report of Additional Special Receiver placed on record. Despite the earlier order of 10th October, 2025, the ad-interim order could not be executed which led to the passing of the order of 8th December, 2025. In view of the manhandling of the Additional Special Receiver, this Court had directed the Additional Special Receiver to revisit the

premises of the Defendant Nos. 1 and 9 and had also directed the concerned police authorities to ensure that adequate police protection is provided to the Plaintiff's representative and the Additional Special Receiver. Despite the specific direction of this Court, it appears that the police authorities have failed to discharge their duty and to enable implementation of the order passed by this Court. The conduct of the Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 9 in blatantly violating the ad interim order passed by this Court, continuing with the infringing activities as also the man handling and assaulting the Additional Special Receiver appointed by this Court to facilitate and assist the Court Receiver in executing the ad-interim order cannot be countenanced. Such conduct of the parties amounts to interference with administration of justice.

10. In order to afford and opportunity to Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 9 to respond to the reports and the material which is placed on record, issue bailable warrants against Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 9 in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- each returnable on 11th February, 2026. The warrants to be executed by the Police Station, Division No.1, Kotwali, Ludhiana, Punjab and Police Station, Division No. 3, Ludhiana, Punjab and report of the execution be placed before this Court.

11. Stand over to **11th February, 2026.**

[SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.]