ITEM NO.21 COURT NO.13 SECTION XIV

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C)Nos.22525-22527/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and orders dated 18-05-2026 in RFA(OS)(COMM) No. 17/2018, in RFA(OS)(COMM) No. 18/2018 and 26-05-2026 in CMAPPL No. 36039/2026 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RAJESH BANSAL & ORS. Respondent(s)

IA No. 186656/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 189451/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES, IA No. 189422/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 08-07-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK ARADHE
(PARTIAL COURT WORKING DAYS BENCH)

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Guru Krishna Kumar, Sr. Adv. (through VC)
Mr. Sajan Poovayya, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Pravin Anand, Adv.
Ms. Vaishali Mittal, Adv.
Mr. Siddhanth Chamola, Adv.
Mr. Gursimran Singh Narula, Adv.
Mr. Lzafeer Ahmad B. F., AOR
Ms. Gitanjali Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Pallavi Bhatnagar, Adv.
Ms. Prachi Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Ira Mahajan, Adv.
Mr. Mushtaq Salim, Adv.
Ms. Raksha Agrawal, Adv.
Mr. Palash Maheshwari, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. P.S. Patwalia, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Swathi Sukumar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. S. Santanam Swaminadhan, Adv.
Ms. Aarthi Rajan, AOR
Mr. Kartik Malhotra, Adv.
Ms. Abhilasha Shrawat, Adv.
Mr. Aman Rawat, Adv.
Ms. Harshika Verma, Adv.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by NIRMALA NEGI
Date: 2026.07.09 16:40:23 IST
Reason:

Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Naveen Nagarjuna, AOR
Ms. Rishika Aggarwal, Adv.
Mr. Karan Dhalla, Adv.
Ms. Anshul Tulsyan, Adv.
Mr. Aryan Panwar, Adv.
Mr. Ritik Raghuwanshi, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. We have heard Mr. Guru Krishna Kumar, Mr. Sajan Poovayya, learned Senior Counsels for the petitioner(s), Mr.P.S.Patwalia, Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, Ms. Swathi Sukumar, learned Senior Counsels for the respondents.

2. The impugned judgment is a judgment of reversal. The plaintiff(s) is in appeal before us. The plaintiff's case is that the *patent* in question is a Standard Essential Patents (SEP) and that the plaintiff(s) was prepared to license under the *Fair, Reasonable, and Non-Discriminatory -'FRAND'* terms to the respondent(s).

3. However, according to the plaintiff(s), the defendant(s) refused the '*FRAND*' arrangement. According to the plaintiff(s), there was infringement of the patent.

4. All this is disputed by the defendant(s). The defendant(s) have raised multifarious defences to contend that the patent is not a Standard Essential Patents (SEP); that there was no infringement and they have also relied on the principle of exhaustion to contend that the suit and the reliefs claimed are not maintainable.

5. Having considered the matter(s) and the arguments, we are

of opinion that the matters requires a detailed consideration.

6. Issue notice to the respondent(s), returnable on 11th August, 2026.

7. Let pleadings be completed.

8. In the meantime, the arrangement that prevailed before the Division Bench of the High Court for the past 08 years, *namely*, 'that the petitioner(s) would keep the *Bank Guarantee* alive' shall continue.

9. We direct that the petitioner(s), till further orders, shall keep the *Bank Guarantee* alive.

10. Mr. Guru Krishna Kumar, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner(s) undertakes, in the event of the impugned orders being sustained and the petitioner(s) losing the appeal(s), they will reimburse the respondent(s) with the upto date amount.

11. Necessary undertaking in this regard be filed within a period of one week from today.

12. Further proceedings, in the High Court for restitution to remain stayed.

13. List the matters on 11th August, 2026.

(NIRMALA NEGI)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(MANOJ KUMAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)