

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Civil Appeal No(s). 7227/2009

BUNKERING BROKERS LIMITED

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

M. V. LAXMI

Respondent(s)

O R D E R

1. In our order dated 09.09.2024, it is observed that the matter is listed for not successfully effecting the service of notice on the sole appellant for making alternative arrangement of counsel.

2. Today also, none appears for the appellant to press the appeal.

3. The appeal is of the year 2008 in which, leave was granted in the year 2009. Thus, the appeal is pending for last about 18 years and the appellant is not represented.

4. In the above circumstances, we have no other option but to dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution.

5. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for non-prosecution reserving liberty in favour of the appellant to revive the matter if the cause of action still survives.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.

.....J.
(PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA)

.....J.
(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)

New Delhi
14-07-2026

ITEM NO.102

COURT NO.13

SECTION III

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Civil Appeal No(s). 7227/2009

BUNKERING BROKERS LIMITED

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

M. V. LAXMI

Respondent(s)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 25481/2010 (IX)

Date : 14-07-2026 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

For Appellant(s) :

Mr. Ashwin Shankar, Adv.
Mr. Sukant Vikram, AOR
Ms. Sonakshi Banga, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

Mrs. Manik Karanjawala, AOR
Ms. Ruby Singh Ahuja, Adv.
Ms. Kritika Sachdeva, Adv.

Ms. Fereshte D Sethna, Adv.
Mr. Urvan Irani, Adv.
Ms. Aditi Shrivastava,, Adv.
Mr. Prakalathan Bathey, Adv.
Ms. Naomi Ting, Adv.
Ms. Sushmita Singh Chauhan, Adv.
Mr. Tarang Saraogi, Adv.
Ms. Bhagyashree Anklesaria, Adv.
Ms. B. Vijayalakshmi Menon, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Civil Appeal No(s). 7227/2009

1. The appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution in terms of the signed order.
2. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

ORDERS ON SLP(C) No. 25481/2010

1. The order assailed in this Special Leave Petition is the order passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay in Appeal No. 640 of 2007 dismissing the appeal preferred by the fourth respondent, *Hatimi Steels*. The petitioner being one of the respondents in the appeal before the High Court can never be said to be aggrieved by an order by which the other parties' appeal was dismissed.
2. At this stage, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that in fact, the petitioner had suffered an adverse order in Appeal No.703 of 2007 and by inadvertence, the order passed in Appeal No. 640 of 2007 has been annexed

and impugned in the appeal.

3. We have seen the impugned order as also the prayer(s) made in the Special Leave Petition. In the prayer clause, the petitioner prays for setting aside the order dated 06th July, 2010 passed by the High Court in Appeal No. 640 of 2007.

4. Therefore, the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner does not appear to be well founded.

5. In view of the above, the Special Leave Petition is dismissed. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the order passed by the High Court in Appeal No. 703 of 2007, it will remain open to the petitioner to take recourse to the remedy as is available in law.

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

(NISHA KHULBEY)
COURT MASTER(SH)

(AKSHAY KUMAR BHORIA)
COURT MASTER(NSH)

(signed order in Civil Appeal No. 7227/2009 is placed on the file)