



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

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3522 OF 2025
IN
COMMERCIAL IP SUIT NO. 386 OF 2017

Dr Ashok M Bhat

...Applicant/Plaintiff

Versus

R V Pharmaceuticals

...Defendant

Mr. Deepak S. Bhalerao Second Assistant to Court Receiver.

Mr. Vinod A. Bhagat a/w Aishwarya M. Lad, Sonam Pradhan i/b V.A. Bhagat for
Applicant/Plaintiff.

CORAM : ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.
DATE : 9th DECEMBER 2025

P.C.

1. By an order dated 11th November, 2025, the Plaintiff was granted ad-interim relief. *Prima-facie* I have found that, the Defendant has acted in breach of the previous orders passed by this Court. On 21st November, 2025, I had appointed an Additional Special Receiver, since the Defendant and the goods in question were situated in the State of Telangana.

2. Mr. Bhagat has placed reliance upon the service affidavit dated 3rd December, 2025 to prove service of these orders upon the Defendant.



3. Furthermore, today the Court Receiver has submitted his report bearing Report No. 547 of 2025, in which the Additional Special Receiver appointed by this Court has interalia recorded as follows:

"6. It is submitted that pursuant to order dated 19th January, 2017, the representative of the Court Receiver, on 9th February, 2017, had visited suit site i.e. Sy. No. 87/39, Plot No. 10 B, Maruthi Nagar, Nandikotkur Road, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh where the impugned goods were found which were seized and sealed. Hereto annexed and marked as Exhibit - E is the copy of order dated 19th January, 2017 and typed site report dated 13th February, 2017."

4. Mr. Bhagat has then pointed out that this court vide order dated 21st November, 2025, has allowed the Interim Application in terms of prayer clause '(j)', which reads thus;

"(j) pending the hearing and final disposal of the present Interim Application, Respondent No. 2 be directed to remain present during the course of hearings before this Hon'ble Court and not to leave the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court;"

5. This court specifically directed the presence of Respondent No.2 namely i.e. E.V. Subba Reddy, who was stated to be a proprietor of Respondent No.1 to be present in Court. Mr. Reddy is not present in the Court today.

6. Since the Respondents appear to be in breach of the previous orders of this Court and the Respondent No.2 has failed to remain present in Court today inspite of specific directions, let bailable warrants in sum of Rs. 25,000/- be issued to Mr. Reddy to secure his presence on the next date. Returnable on **23rd December, 2025.**

[ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.]