



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE**

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK RUSIA

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE BINOD KUMAR DWIVEDI

ON THE 24th OF JULY, 2025

ARBITRATION APPEAL No. 102 of 2025

***TASKUS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED THROUHG ITS AUTHORIZED
SIGNATORY RAHUL RAGHUWANSHI***

Versus

ABHISHEK KUMAR SHRIVASTAVA

WITH

ARBITRATION APPEAL No. 103 of 2025

***TASKUS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED THROUHG ITS AUTHORIZED
SIGNATORY RAHUL RAGHUWANSHI***

Versus

BHAVANA YADAV

ARBITRATION APPEAL No. 104 of 2025

***TASKUS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED THROUHG ITS AUTHORIZED
SIGNATORY RAHUL RAGHUWANSHI***

Versus

ANSHUL CHAWLA

**ARBITRATION APPEAL No. 105 of 2025**

***TASKUS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED THROUHG ITS AUTHORIZED
SIGNATORY RAHUL RAGHUWANSHI***

Versus

BHAGAT SINGH BHATI

Appearance:

Shri Akshay Sapre – Advocate for the appellant (through VC).

Shri Apoorv Kurup – Advocate for the respondents (through VC).

ORDER

Per: Justice Vivek Rusia

1. This order shall govern the disposal of AA No.102/2025, AA No.103/2025, AA No.104/2025 & AA No.105/2025. Regard being had to the similitude of the controversy involved in the appeals described above, they are heard analogously and disposed of by this common order.

2. Present appeals are filed against the interlocutory order dated 15.5.2025 passed in MJC-AV Nos.32/2025, 33/2025, 35/2025 & 39/2025 by the Commercial Court.

For convenience the facts are being taken from AA No.102/2025:-

3. The appellant is an outsourcing company incorporated under the Companies Act, 2013. The respondent was appointed as a Manager (HR). He was terminated on 10.2.2025. The respondent approached the Commercial Court challenging the termination and seeking reinstatement with backwages. The respondent sought a temporary injunction to the effect that the appellant be restrained from reporting his termination on the ground of misconduct until the validity of termination is adjudicated by the Arbitral



Tribunal. The appellant appeared and filed reply to the application for temporary injunction. Before deciding the application of temporary injunction along with an application under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred as “Act of 1996)”, the respondent filed an application under Section 151 of CPC seeking ad interim temporary injunction. Vide order dated 15.5.2025 the learned Court has granted interim mandatory injunction that the non applicant i.e. appellant herein not to communicate the termination reasons whatsoever to the prospective companies or employer until further order or till the decision of application filed under Section 9 of the Act of 1996, whichever is earlier.

We have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

4. Any observation made by us on the merit of the case will affect the interest of the parties before the Commercial Court. The main relief in the application filed under Section 9 of the Act of 1996 is to grant a temporary injunction till the commencement of arbitration proceedings. Therefore, when main relief is of a temporary injunction, then the application under Section 151 of CPC seeking ad interim injunction till the application under Section 9 is decided, is maintainable before the Court.

5. Shri Sapre, learned counsel appearing for the appellant submits that the appellant is not intending to inform the reasons of termination to employer or companies unless it is asked from the appellant.

6. Counsel for the parties submit that the Commercial Court has fixed the case in the first week of December, 2025 for final argument.



7. Therefore, in view of the above, the appeals are **dismissed** without interfering with the impugned order. Let the Commercial Court decide the application under Section 9 in accordance with law.

8. Signed order be kept in the file of AA No.102/2025 and a copy thereof be placed in the file of AA No.103/2025, AA No.104/2025 & AA No.105/2025.

(VIVEK RUSIA)
JUDGE

(BINOD KUMAR DWIVEDI)
JUDGE