

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).33113/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 25-08-2026 in CMA No. 524/2025 passed by the High Court for The State of Telangana at Hyderabad]

M/S SANTOSH DHABA EXCLUSIVE

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

M/S THE SANTOSH ORIGINAL & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 282524/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

Date : 21-09-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Rajiv Shakdhar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ashok Ramkumar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Joby P. Varghese, AOR
Mr. Achuthan Sreekumar, Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. Pranav Prasoon, Adv.
Mr. Jagmeet Singh Randhawa, Adv.
Mr. Amrish Ranjan Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Rashi, Adv.
Mr. Aby P Varghese, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Gopal Sankarnarayan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Venkat Reddy Donthi Reddy, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ashish Giri, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Nina Nariman, Adv.
Mr. Avv Bhaskar, Adv.
Mr. Zafar Inayat, Adv.
Ms. Muskan Joshi, Adv.
Ms. S. Lakshmi Iyer, AOR

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

1. We heard Mr. Kapil Sibal and Mr. Rajiv Shakdhar, the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner (original plaintiff) and on the other hand, Mr. Gopal Sankarnarayan, the learned senior counsel appearing for the respondents (original defendants).
2. This litigation has something to do with the question whether the *ex-parte* interim injunction which, at one point of time was granted to the plaintiff continued or not.
3. In para 51 of the impugned order, the High Court has observed thus:-

“51. After careful perusal of the Register and reports of both the Courts below, this Court is of the firm opinion that there is no existing *ad interim ex parte* injunction order on 15.12.2025, as apparent on the face of record, there was no extension application on that particular day and there was no endorsement on the docket as regards extension.”

4. Both, Mr. Kapil Sibal and Mr. Rajiv Shakdhar have many things to say as regards this finding of fact recorded by the High Court in para 51, referred to above. Both the learned senior counsel have many other contentions to raise.
5. We do not propose to get into any further debate on this.
6. We are informed that the matter is now coming up before the Commercial Court on 13th October, 2026. On 13th October, 2026, the Court is to hear the plaintiff insofar as his

application for injunction is concerned. The other side has also filed a counter claim and an injunction application.

7. We are of the view that it will be in the fitness of things if the Commercial Court, without fail hears both the parties on their respective applications on 13th October, 2026 and take appropriate decision on the merits of their respective applications without being influenced in any manner by any of the observations made so far by the High Court in the present litigation.

8. Since we want the Commercial Court to hear the applications on 13th October, 2026, we expect that no time will be prayed for by either of the parties.

9. With the aforesaid, this petition stands disposed of.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET KAUR)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)