

\$~

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Date of decision: 5th May, 2014

CO. APPL. (M) NO. OF 80/2014

SMARTTRUST INFOSOLUTION PRIVATE LIMITED & ANOTHER

.....Applicants

Through: Ms. Beena Rani Panday and Mr. Rohit Aggarwal

Advocates for the Applicants

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J.: (ORAL)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on account of a typographical error in the index, urgent application and memo of parties, it has been mentioned that the application has been filed under Sections 230 to 240 of the Companies Act, 2013. The application, in fact, has been filed under Sections 391 to 394 of the Companies Act, 1956, which is correctly reflected in the main petition as well as the affidavit and in the scheme of amalgamation the correct provision has been mentioned. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays that the petitioner may be permitted to correct these errors and file a corrected memo of parties as well as the index.
2. The oral prayer of the petitioner is allowed. The petitioner may file the corrected copies of papers within two days.

3. This first motion joint application has been filed under Sections 391 to 394 of the Companies Act, 1956 ('Act') in connection with the Scheme of Arrangement ('Scheme') of SMARTTRUST INFOSOLUTION PRIVATE LIMITED (hereinafter referred to as Applicant/Transferor Company) with GIESECKE & DEVRIENT INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED (hereinafter referred to as 'Applicant Transferee Company') [hereinafter collectively referred to as 'Applicant Companies']. A copy of the proposed Scheme is enclosed with this application
4. The Registered Offices of the Applicant Companies are situated within the National Capital Territory of Delhi and are within the jurisdiction of this Court.
5. The details of the dates of incorporation of the Applicant Companies, their authorized, issued, subscribed and paid up capital have been set out in the Application.
6. The copies of the Memorandum of Association and Articles of Association as well as the latest audited annual accounts for the year ended 31st March 2013 of the Applicant Companies have also been enclosed with the application.
7. The learned counsel for the Applicant Companies submits that no proceedings under Sections 235 to 251 of the Act are pending against any of the Applicant Companies as on the date of the application.

8. The proposed Scheme has been approved by the Board of Directors ('BoDs') of the Applicant Companies. The copies of the board resolutions have also been enclosed with the application.
9. The status of the equity shareholders, secured creditors and unsecured creditors of the Applicant Companies and the consents obtained from them for the proposed Scheme is provided in the application which reads as under:-

Company	No. of equity share-holders	Consent given	No. of secured creditors	Consent given	No. of unsecured creditors	Consent given
Transferor company	2	All	NIL	N.A.	2	All
Transferee company	2	All	NIL	N.A.	32	27 (Value – 94.27%) Numbers- 84.37%)

10. A prayer has been made for dispensing with the requirement of convening the meetings of equity shareholders and unsecured creditors of Applicant Companies. It is stated that the said Equity shareholders and Unsecured Creditors have duly given their no objection certificates for the approval of the proposed Scheme.
11. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that out of 32 unsecured creditors of the transferee company, 30 creditors have given their consent. With respect to the Tata Consultancy

Services Pvt. Ltd. though the consent has been placed on record but the Resolution of the Board of Directors has not been placed on record. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even if it was assumed that Tata Consultancy Services Limited, Hewett Parkard India Sales (P) Ltd. and Leo Prince Comp (P) Limited have not consented to the scheme of the petitioner and excluding these, the consent of 94.27% of the unsecured creditors has been received.

12. Prayer for dispensation of the meeting of the equity shareholders and the unsecured creditors is sought for as the consent has been received from more than 75% of the unsecured creditors in value and more than 50% in number of the transferee company and 100% consent from the unsecured creditors of the transferee company has been received. With regard to the shareholders, 100% of the consent of the shareholders of both the transferor and the transferee company has been received.
13. In view of the written consents/NOC given by 84.37% in number and 94.27% in value of the Unsecured Creditors of the Transferee Company, the requirement of convening meeting of Unsecured Creditors of Transferee Company is dispensed with.
14. In view of the written consents/ NOC obtained and the averments made in the application and the body corporate's consents are supported by the board resolution, the requirement

of convening the meeting of the Equity shareholders of the Applicant companies and Unsecured Creditors of the Transferor Company, the requirement of convening their meeting is dispensed with.

15. Since the Applicant Companies does not have any secured creditors in the Applicant Companies, hence the requirement of convening the meetings of secured creditors do not arise.
16. The Application stands allowed in the aforesaid terms.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014
st

\$~

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Date of decision: 5th May, 2014

CO. APPL. (M) NO. OF 83 /2014

Anand Buildwell Consultants Private Limited & ANR.

.....Applicants

Through: Mr. Mahesh Agarwal and Rajeev Kumar
Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J.: (ORAL)

1. This joint first motion Application under Sections 391 to 394 of the Companies Act, 1956 ("Act") is in connection with a Scheme of Amalgamation ("Scheme") of Anand Buildwell Consultants Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as Applicant-1/Transferor Company-1) and Polym Agencies Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as Applicant-2/Transferor Company-2) With Spherical Collection Agency Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as Applicant-3/Transferee Company-3) (hereinafter all Companies collectively referred to as "Applicant Companies") and their respective Shareholders. The Scheme has been enclosed as Annexure A to the present Application.
2. The Registered Offices of all the Applicant Companies are situated at New Delhi, within the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court.

3. The details of the dates of incorporation of the Applicant Companies, their authorized, issued, subscribed and paid up capital have been set out in application.
4. The copies of the Memorandum and Articles of Association, latest Audited Accounts as on 31.03.2013 of the Applicant Companies have also been enclosed with the Application.
5. Learned Counsel for the Applicant Companies submits that no proceeding under Sections 235 to 251 of the Act is pending against the Applicant Companies as on the date of the Application.
6. The proposed scheme has been approved by the Board of Directors of all the Applicant Companies. Certified true copies of the Board Resolutions have been filed along with the Application.
7. The status of the shareholders, secured and unsecured creditors of the Applicant Companies and the consents obtained from them for the proposed scheme is clearly apparent from the chart given in the application which is as follows:-

Company	No. of Share holder	Consent Given	No of Secured Creditor	Consent Given	No of Unsecured Creditor	Consent Given

Applicant 1/Transferor Co.1	12	12	Nil	NA	1	1
Applicant 2/Transferor co.2	47	47	Nil	NA	36	35 (98.18% in value and 97.30% in number)
Applicant 3/transferor Co.3	2	2	Nil	NA	2	2

8. A prayer has been made for dispensing with the requirement of convening meetings of equity shareholders and unsecured creditors of the Applicant Companies. It is stated that said equity shareholders and unsecured creditors have only given their no objection Certificate for the approval of the proposed scheme.
9. With regard to the unsecured creditor of applicant No.1, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is only one unsecured creditor and the consent letter of the unsecured creditor has been placed on record, however, there is no resolution of the Board of Directors supporting the letter of consent. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the consent letter alongwith resolution of the Board of Directors shall be filed alongwith second motion petition and prays for

dispensation of the meeting of the sole unsecured creditors.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies on the judgment dated 22.10.2013 of this Court in Company Application (M) No.142/2013, Manav Holding Private Limited.
11. In view of the above, the meeting is dispensed with subject to Transferor Company No.1 filing board resolution in support of the consent letter of the sole unsecured creditor at the time of the second motion petition.
12. In view of the Written consents, NOC by 98.18% in value and 97.30% in number of the unsecured creditors of the transferee company, the requirement of convening meetings of unsecured creditors of transferee company is dispensed with.
13. In view of the written consents/NOC given, the requirement of convening the meetings of equity shareholders and unsecured creditors of Applicant Companies are dispensed with, since the Applicant Companies do not have any secured creditors. Hence, the requirement of convening the meeting of secured creditors does not arise.
14. The application stands allowed in above terms.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

05 MAY 2014
st

\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **OMP 914/2011**

ITE INDIA PVT. LTD. Petitioner

Through Mr. Vikas Mehta, Advocate.

versus

MUKESH SHARMA AND OTHERS Respondents

Through Ms. Neeru Sharma, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

Since substantial arguments of the parties are yet to be advanced, the matter is released from part heard.

List the matter before the Roaster Bench for directions on 19th May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014
st

\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ OMP 255/2010 & IA Nos.6264/2010, 16585/2010, 16586/2010 &
903/2014

ROGER SHASHOUA AND OTHERS Petitioner

Through Mr. Vikas Mehta, Advocate.

versus

MUKESH SHARMA AND OTHERS Respondents

Through Ms. Neeru Sharma, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

Since substantial arguments of the parties are yet to be
advanced, the matter is released from part heard.

List the matter before the Roaster Bench for directions on 19th
May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~ 54

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CO.PET. 386/2000 & CA Nos.712/2014, 1002/2014 & 1003/2014
M/S DELHI STOCK EXCHANGE ASSOCN. LTD. Petitioner
Through None.

versus

UJALA LEASING LTD. Respondent
Through None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER
% **05.05.2014**

None appears for the parties.

Renotify on 6th May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014
st

\$~21 & 22

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 595/2013**

TATA CAPITAL FINANCIAL SERVICES LTD Petitioner

Through Mr. Saurabh Kripal with Mr. Varun
Kumar and Ms. Saloni Chowdhry,
Advocates.

versus

NET 4 INDIA LTD

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Gaurav Kejriwal with Mr. Gaurav
Choudhary, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

05.05.2014

Learned counsel for the respondent submits that an application placing on record certain facts has been filed, however, the same has not been listed. Learned counsel for the respondent further states that an effort is being made to resolve the dispute and to give a proposal to the petitioner for payment of their dues.

List on 19th May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~30

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 61/2014**

IN THE MATTER OF MADHAV FINCAP PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Tariq Muneer with Mr. Avinash
Kumar, Advocates.

versus

....

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

05.05.2014

Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for some time to file an additional affidavit on behalf of the parent transferee company that the transferee company shall comply with the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Reserve Bank of India.

At request, adjourned to 21st May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 9/2014 & CA 18-19/2014**

M/S TAURAS FINANCIAL SERVICES PVT LTD..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Praveen Mahajan, Advocate.

versus

TIRUPATI BUILDING AND OFFICES PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Respondent

**Through Mr. Rajeev Saxena with Mr. Rohan
Ahuja, Advocates.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% 05.05.2014

Learned counsel for the respondent prays for time to file reply to the petition.

Let reply to the petition be filed within four weeks. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within four weeks thereafter.

List on 26th August, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~23

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 633/2013**

VRB FOODS PVT LTD & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through Ms. Beena Rani Pandey with Mr.
Rohit Aggarwal, Advocates.

versus

.....

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Atma Sah, Assistant ROC for
Registrar of Companies.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

05.05.2014

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that additional affidavit in response to the observations of the Regional Director has been re-filed in the morning today and prays for an adjournment.

At request, adjourned to 8th May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 383/2011**

NATRAJ SALES

..... Petitioner

Through None.

versus

TELCO WATER TECHNOLOGY PVT LTD Respondent

Through Ms. Yukti Gupta, proxy for Mr.
Ashish Makhija, Advocate for
Official Liquidator.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

Report 286/2014

By order dated 12.11.2013, the petitioner was directed to deposit costs of publication of Rs.1,17,676/- to the Official Liquidator. The said costs were not deposited and by the order dated 19.03.2014, counsel for the petitioner was directed to be present in Court on 16.04.2014. On 16.04.2014, counsel for the petitioner had sought two weeks time to deposit the costs for the publication of the citation. The order of 16.04.2014 records that in the event the said costs are not deposited, the petition would be dismissed. Despite a peremptory order being passed, neither the costs have been deposited nor anyone is appearing on behalf of the petitioner.

In view of the persistent default of the petitioner, the petition is, thus, liable to be dismissed in terms of the order dated 16.04.2014.

Learned counsel appearing for the Official Liquidator prays for an adjournment to ascertain if any other expenditure has been incurred by the Official Liquidator.

Renotify on 16th May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014
st

\$~20

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 535/2013 & CA 1845/2013**

M/S SUKI CREATIONS PVT LTD Petitioner

Through Mr. Uchit Bhandari, Advocate.

versus

M/S CLASSIC BOTTLE CAPS PVT LTD Respondent

Through Mr. K. Bhardwaj with Mr. Ajay
Sejwal, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for some time to file
rejoinder. Let rejoinder be filed within two weeks.

Renotify on 19th August, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~48

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.APPL.(M) 84/2014**

IN THE MATTER OF HOST BUILDWELL PVT.LTD. & OTHERS

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Rajeev Kumar, Advocate.

versus

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

It is noticed that at pages 391 to 405, the consent letters have been filed stating that the signatories are unsecured creditors of Polym Agencies Private Limited. Polym Agencies Private Limited is not an applicant in this petition. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that there are two petitions which were filed and in one petition Polym Agencies Private Limited is a party. There appears to be an error and prays for some time to take appropriate steps for correction of the error.

At request, adjourned to 12th May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~50

*

+

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
CO.PET. 287/2014 & CA 1015/2014
IN THE MATTER OF AR AEROTEC PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Ashish Middha, Advocate.

versus

....

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

This is a petition under Sections 391-394 of the Companies Act, 1956 (Section Motion).

Issue notice to the Official Liquidator, Registrar of Companies and the Central Government through Regional Director, North, Ministry of Corporate Affairs.

Mr. Atma Sah, Asstt. ROC, accepts notice on behalf of the Registrar of Companies and Regional Director.

Mr. S.B. Gautam, Official Liquidator accepts notice.

Let a response to the petition be filed within eight weeks. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within four weeks thereafter.

Notice be also published in "Business Standard" (English) and Jansatta (Hindi) edition.

List for hearing on 27th August, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014/st

\$~49

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 286/2014**

GATEWAY CAPITAL LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Krishnam Venugopal, Sr.
Advocate with Mr. Aman Leekha and
Mr. Kaushik Mishra, Advocates.

versus

ICICI PRUDENTIAL ASSET MANAGEMENT COMPANY LTD.

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

CO.Pet. 286/2014

Issue notice to the respondent by ordinary process and speed post, returnable on 10th September, 2014.

CA 1006/2014 (under Rule 9 of the Companies (Court) Rules.

Issue notice to the respondent by ordinary process and speed post, returnable on 10th September, 2014.

CA 1007/2014 (under Section 450 of the Companies Act, 1956.

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not press this application at this stage.

Dismissed as not pressed.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~44

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CO.PET. 225/2014
GLINTS GLOBAL GENERAL TRADING LLC THROUGH MR.
SANJEEV MENON Petitioner
Through Ms. Anupama Gupta, Advocate.
versus

SR FOILS AND TISSUE LTD. THROUGH ITS CHIEF
MANAGING DIRECTOR Respondent
Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

CA 990/2014

By the present application, the petitioner has sought a restraint on the respondent company from alienating its moveable and immovable assets without the leave of the Court. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the amount owed by the respondent is approximately Rs.7 crores, there is an apprehension that the respondent company may create a third party interest in the moveable and immovable assets of the company.

Issue notice to the respondents by ordinary process and speed post, returnable on 23rd July, 2014, the date already fixed. Dasti in addition.

In the meantime, the respondent company is restrained from selling, alienating or transferring its immovable assets except in the ordinary course of business.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014/st

\$~43

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 141/2014**

M/S GOKUL PROJECTS

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Deepak Dhingra with Mr. Rajesh
Kumar Verma, Advocates.

versus

HARYANA CITY GAS DISTRIBUTION LTD Respondent

Through Mr. Anil Sapra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sanjeet Singh, Advocate for the
respondent No.1.
Mr. Sanjay Mishra, Advocate for
Haryana City Gas Dist. Ltd. for Kapil
Chopra Group.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

CA No.1013/2014

This is an application by the petitioner company seeking directions for issuance of a notice to the respondents in the main petition. As per the petitioner, the company petition had been listed for the first time on 28.02.2014, when the Hon'ble Judge was pleased to recuse from the matter. Thereafter, the matter was listed on 14.03.2014 and could not be taken up on account of paucity of time and had been adjourned. Thereafter, the matter was listed on 04.04.2014, when the Hon'ble Court was on leave and the matter was

adjourned to 18.07.2014. In these circumstances, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that preliminary hearing in the matter could not take place and notice could not be issued.

It is noticed that neither the matter has been considered at the pre-notice state nor the notice has been directed to be issued and served on the respondent. However, the respondents are present in Court represented through a counsel.

In view of the above, the application is allowed. The matter is taken up for hearing.

CO.PET. 141/2014

Issue notice to the respondents.

Mr. Sanjeet Singh, Advocate and Mr. Sanjay Mishra, Advocate enter appearance for the respondent company and contend that there are disputes between the Directors of the respondents company pending before the Company Law Board. Two sets of respondents counsel submit that there is a restriction on the holding of the Board Meeting.

Let a reply to the petition be filed within four weeks. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within four weeks thereafter.

List on 9th September, 2014.

CA 472/2014

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not press this application at this stage.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014/st

\$~42

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CO.PET. 140/2014

BUCON ENGINEERS & INFRASTRUCTURE PVT LTD

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Deepak Dhingra with Mr. Rajesh
Kumar Verma, Advocates.

versus

HARYANA CITY GAS DISTRIBUTIONS LTD Respondent

Through Mr. Anil Sapra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sanjeet Singh, Advocate for the
respondent No.1.
Mr. Sanjay Mishra, Advocate for
Haryana City Gas Dist. Ltd. for Kapil
Chopra Group.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

05.05.2014

CA No.1011/2014

This is an application by the petitioner company seeking directions for issuance of a notice to the respondents in the main petition. As per the petitioner, the company petition had been listed for the first time on 28.02.2014, when the Hon'ble Judge was pleased to recuse from the matter. Thereafter, the matter was listed on 14.03.2014 and could not be taken up on account of paucity of time and had been adjourned. Thereafter, the matter was listed on 04.04.2014, when the Hon'ble Court was on leave and the matter was adjourned to 18.07.2014. In these circumstances, learned counsel for

the petitioner submits that preliminary hearing in the matter could not take place and notice could not be issued.

It is noticed that neither the matter has been considered at the pre-notice state nor the notice has been directed to be issued and served on the respondent. However, the respondents are present in Court represented through a counsel.

In view of the above, the application is allowed. The matter is taken up for hearing.

CO.PET. 140/2014

Issue notice to the respondents.

Mr. Sanjeet Singh, Advocate and Mr. Sanjay Mishra, Advocate enter appearance for the respondent company and contend that there are disputes between the Directors of the respondents company pending before the Company Law Board. Two sets of respondents counsel submit that there is a restriction on the holding of the Board Meeting.

Let a reply to the petition be filed within four weeks. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within four weeks thereafter.

List on 9th September, 2014.

CA 467/2014

Learned counsel for the petitioner does not press this application at this stage.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~40

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 11/2014**

KANODIA TECHNOPLAST

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Vikramaditya Bhaskar, Advocate
for the applicant.

versus

K.P.POUCHES PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

CA 1014/2014

The present application has been moved by Cryogenic Food Processing Pvt. Ltd. seeking desealing of the premises bearing No.46, Rama Road, New Delhi. As per the applicant, the applicant has taken the premises on rent on 15.09.2007. The applicant contends that the applicant has no connection with the company in liquidation and the company in liquidation was a tenant in the premises and had vacated the premises on 31.03.2007. Learned counsel for the applicant contends that some goods and machineries of the company in liquidation are lying in the premises.

Issue notice.

Mr. S.B. Gautam, Official Liquidator accepts notice.

Let a response to the application be filed within a period of one week. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within three days thereafter.

List on 20th May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014/st

\$~39

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CO.PET. 101/2013

PREMIER INFRA-CON PVT LTD

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Ashish Middha, Advocate.

versus

..

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

05.05.2014

CA 1012/2014

By the present application, the applicant seeks directions for taking on record the amended valuation report and amended scheme of amalgamation. As per the petitioner, on 01.05.2013, at the time of final hearing of the matter the application seeking to place on record the amended scheme was not disposed of.

Issue notice to the Regional Director and the Official Liquidator.

Mr. Atma Sah, Asstt. ROC, accepts notice on behalf of the Registrar of Companies.

Mr. S.V. Gautam, Official Liquidator accepts notice.

Let a response to the application be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within four weeks thereafter.

List on 27th August, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014/st

\$~36

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 72/1997**

IN THE MATTER OF M/S MORADABAD SYNTEX LTD

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Yukti Gupta, proxy for Mr.
Ashish Makhija, Advocate for
Official Liquidator.
Mr. R.K. Raizada, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Vivek Gupta, Advocates for the
applicant.

versus

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Abhishek Anand with Mr.
Naveen Kumar, Advocates for IDBI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

CA 1004/2014 (under Rule 6 & 9 of the Companies Court Rules)

Issue notice to IDBI as well as Official Liquidator.

Mr. Abhishek Anand, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of
IDBI.

Ms. Yukti Gupta, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of Official
Liquidator.

Copy of the application be supplied to counsel for non-
applicants within two days.

Let reply to the said application be filed within four weeks.
Rejoinder, if any, be filed within three weeks thereafter.

List on 25th July, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014/st

\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 306/2011**

VANDANA ISPAT LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Anup Jain, Advocate.

versus

PREM POWER CONSTRUCTION PRIVATE LTD Respondent

Through Mr. Navroop Singh, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **05.05.2014**

Request for an adjournment is made on behalf of the petitioner,
which is not opposed by the respondent.

Renotify on 6th August, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st

\$~45

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CCP(CO.) 8/2014 & CA 1010/2014**

JAI GOPAL & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. V.N. Sharma, Advocate.

versus

MADHU GUPTA

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

05.05.2014

Subject to the orders of Hon'ble the Chief Justice, list before
some other Bench on 9th May, 2014.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 05, 2014

st