



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

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 2797 OF 2025

IN

COMPANY PETITION NO. 468 OF 2013

Kumar Motors Pvt. Ltd. Through Its
Managing Director Shri Rajiv Nair

...Applicant

Versus

Official Liquidator Of Kumar Motors
Pvt. Ltd. Bombay High Court & Ors.

...Respondents

WITH

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE NO.1 OF 2025

IN

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 2797 OF 2025

WITH

OFFICIAL LIQUIDATOR REPORT NO. 74 OF 2024

WITH

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 2917 OF 2025

IN

COMPANY PETITION NO. 468 OF 2013

Mr. Aditya Pimple a/w Mr. Aakash Joshi and Mr. Amarjit Prasad, for the Applicant in IA/2997/2025.

Ms. Aradhya Dixit i/b Apex Law Partners, for the Applicant in IA/2917/2025.

Mr. Shikhil Suri, Sr. Adv. a/w Mr. Ameya Deosthale, Ms. Bhoomi Shah i/b Stratage Law Partners, for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

Mr. Girish N. Kulkarni Respondent No.3 and Ms. Sarika G. Kulkarni, Respondent No.4 are present in person.

Mr. Rushabh Sheth, for the Official Liquidator.

Mr. J. P. Gautam, Dy. Official Liquidator, present.

CORAM : ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.

DATE : 9th FEBRUARY, 2026



P.C.

1. At the outset, Mr. Suri, learned senior counsel for Respondent Nos. 3 and 4, submits that the question of contempt against his clients does not arise, since they had in fact never been called upon by the Official Liquidator to make payment of the security charges.
2. Mr. Suri further points out that his clients had duly discharged payment of the security charges up to the date of dismissal of the Petition and it was now the obligation of the Applicant and the secured creditors to make payment of the security charges. He, therefore, prays that the personal presence of Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 be dispensed with on their undertaking that they shall remain present either physically or virtually when the Court so requires.
3. On the next date, the presence of Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 would not be required.
4. Stand over to **23rd February 2026**.

[ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.]