$~61

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4571/2018

MOHAK CHNAD GUPTA AND ORS. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saurabh Kalia with Mr. Siddharth Nagpal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17716/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4571/2018 & CM APP No.17715/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: MNG Human Development Center Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). Furthermore, the petitioners states that he had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that on account of the

aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~68

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4578/2018

DEEP CHOPRA AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Ruchir Bhatia, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC with Mr. Aditya Goyal, Adv. for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17730/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4578/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17729/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Tranztrade Logistics Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company had not done any business for more than two years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that on account of the

aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. To be noted, the petitioners have obtained the consent of the other persons who are not petitioners before this court but are Directors on the Board of the subject company.

5.1 It is in this background that the petitioners have filed affidavits dated 26.04.2018.

6. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

7. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with the operative directions contained in Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr*.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be

in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~67

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4577/2018

PRADIP KUMAR CHAKRAVARTY & ORS ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashish Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Anju Gupta with Mr. Mohit Bhardwaj and Mr. R.L. Goel, Advs. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17728/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4577/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17727/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, says that he wishes to approach the NCLT for reviving company by the name: Mercury Cranes & Hoists Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company").

4. To be noted, the Company was struck off from the Register of Companies by the ROC upon its failure to file the requisite financial statements and returns. The petitioners, I am told, were appointed as Directors on the Board of the Company.

5. In view of the fact that the petitioners wish to approach the NCLT to revive the Company in consonance with the provisions of Section 252 of the

Companies Act, 2013, the learned counsel for the official respondents submits that the ROC will not oppose the revival provided the appeal is filed before 07.05.2018.

6. Having regard to the aforesaid, the writ petition is disposed of giving liberty to the petitioners to approach the NCLT by way of an appeal. Since the captioned Writ petition was filed on the day the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 ("Scheme") was to expire, leave is granted to the Petitioner(s) to institute the appeal with NCLT on or before 07.05.2018. Pending the decision in the appeal, there would be a stay on the operation of the list of disqualified directors insofar as it concerns the petitioners herein. Furthermore, the respondents will also activate the DIN and DSC of the petitioners.

7. Needless to say if the petitioners fail to file an appeal within the timeline given above, or fails in persuading the NCLT to revive the Company, the stay on the operation of the list of disqualified directors, insofar as it concerns the petitioners, would stand dissolved automatically with necessary consequences. This direction would also apply if the petitioners fails to take requisite steps under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (“Scheme”) after it is ordered to be revived by NCLT.

8. Dasti under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~66

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4576/2018

LAKHWINDER SINGH AND ORS. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Gursat Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Bhagwan Swarup Shukla, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17726/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4576/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17725/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Oncology Healthcare Services Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the company failed to generate any business since 2013. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that on account of the

aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~82

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4593/2018

GANAPATHI ARUMUGAM AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi with Ms. Preeti Kumra and Mr. Raj Rishi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17754/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4593/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17753/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Integrated Bio Technologies India Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). To be noted, counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.1 was appointed as a Director on the Board of another company by the name: Maway Gold and Green Fuels Limited which was struck off by the ROC, and that a writ petition has been filed before this Court in that behalf as well. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the

Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official

respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~81

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4592/2018

GANAPATHI ARUMUGAM AND ORS. ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi with Ms. Preeti Kumra and Mr. Raj Rishi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17752/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4592/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17751/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Maway Gold and Green Fuels Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver

that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4.1 To be noted, counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.1 was appointed as a Director on the Board of another company by the name: Integrated Bio Technologies India Private Limited which was struck off by the ROC, and that a writ petition has been filed before this Court in that behalf as well.

4.2 Counsel for the petitioners further submits that petitioner no.3 was appointed as a Director on the Board of another company by the name: RM Gold Private Limited which was struck off by the ROC, and that no steps have been taken by petitioner no.3 in that behalf.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s), except petitioner no.3, will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr*.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~80

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4591/2018

VIRENDRA SINGH AND ANR. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Saurabh Kalia, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17750/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4591/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17749/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Bhardwaj, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Shishodia Cassette Industries Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the company failed to generate any business since 2012. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant

provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it was on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~72

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4582/2018

MUKESH GUPTA AND ORS. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saurabh Kalia with Mr. Siddharth Nagpal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17735/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4582/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17734/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Shukla, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Winsol Energy Solutions Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The Petitioners state that the Company had been non-operational subsequent to 2011-2012. Furthermore, the petitioners states that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~73

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4583/2018

ARVIND SRIVASTAVA & ANR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashish Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Gogna, CGSC for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17737/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4583/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17736/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Gogna, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of companies by the name: Money Real Estate Private Limited and Sprit Exim Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Companies"). The Petitioners state that the Companies had been non-operational since the last three years. Furthermore, the petitioners states that they had not filed the Companies' financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The

petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~74

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4584/2018

SAHEJ BAKSHI AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gursat Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17739/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4584/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17738/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Shukla, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of companies by the name: Double Vision Entertainment Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The Petitioners state that the Company had been non-operational since 2012. Furthermore, the petitioners states that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the

aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~75

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4585/2018

ANKUR GUPTA AND ORS. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Ashish Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. B. S. Shukla, CGSC for UOI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17741/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4585/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17740/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Shukla, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of companies by the name: Integrated Industrial Process Solutions Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The Petitioners state that the Company had been non-operational for more than three years. Furthermore, the petitioners states that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it

is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~76

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4586/2018

JETINDER PAL VERMA AND ANR. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Ashish Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17743/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4586/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17742/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Shukla, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of companies by the name: Orchid IT Solutions Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The Petitioners state that the Company had been non-operational for more than three years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the

aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not

covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~84

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4595/2018

MAYANK GUPTA AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saurabh Kalia with Mr. Siddharth Nagpal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17758/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4595/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17757/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Shukla, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of companies by the name: Aeon Infratech Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The Petitioners state that the Company had been non-operational since its incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by

this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C)

9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~2

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7883/2009

SHRI NAZVEEN KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit for Ms. Sonali Malhotra, Adv.

versus

NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Diwankar Sethi, Adv. for Mr. Gaurang Kanth, Adv. for R-2/DSIIDC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **01.05.2018**

Renotify the matter on 16.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~54 & 69

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4539/2018 & CM. APPL. No.17533/2018

SANDHYA CHEMPLAST PVT. LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sujata Kashyap with Mr. Ateka Khan, Advs.

versus

THE ORIENTAL INSURANCE COMPANY LTD. AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Pradeep Gaur with Mr. Amit Gaur, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Abhinav Singh with Mr. Vinod Kr. Goyal and Mr. Mohit Aggarwal, Advs. for R-3.

\+ W.P.(C) 4579/2018 & CM. APPL. No.17731/2018

SANSKRITI SOCIETY FOR EDUCATION, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sujata Kashyap with Mr. Ateka Khan, Advs.

versus

THE ORIENTAL INSURANCE COMPANY LTD. AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Pradeep Gaur with Mr. Amit Gaur, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Abhinav Singh with Mr. Vinod Kr. Goyal and Mr. Mohit Aggarwal, Advs. for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. The grievance of the petitioners is that their matters are not being heard by the District Consumer Forum – VII, Delhi/respondent No.2 on account of inadequate staff.

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Gaur accepts notice for respondent No.1, while Mr. Abhinav Singh accepts notice for respondent No.3.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.3 says that he will take instructions in the matter as to why adequate staff is not deployed at the concerned forum.

5. Renotify the matter on 27.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~48

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4526/2018

SUNITA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pradeep Gupta with Mr. Parinav Gupta, Ms. Mansi Gupta and Mr. Moazzam Ali, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjoy Ghose, ASC for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM. APPL.No.17504-05/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4526/2018 & CM. APPL. No.17506/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Ghose accepts notice for the respondents. In view of the order that I propose to pass, Mr. Ghose says that he does not wish to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

4. The limited relief that the petitioner seeks is the disposal of a representation dated 5.4.2018, which is marked as Annexure P-9 and appended at pages 80 to 82 of the paper book.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to deliberate upon the aforementioned representation of the petitioner and, thereafter, pass a speaking order qua the same.

6. The concerned authority will also call upon the petitioner and/or her authorized representative for hearing in the matter before passing a speaking order. A copy of the speaking order will be furnished to the petitioner. In case the petitioner is aggrieved, she will be at liberty to assail the same in the manner known to law.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~43

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3347/2018

DEEPAK DATWANI AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saurabh Kalia with Mr. Siddharth Nagpal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. P.S. Singh, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM. APPL.No.17501/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. P.S. Singh accepts notice for respondent No.1 & 2 and says he does not oppose the relief claimed in the application. The substantive relief claimed in the application is as follows:

> "*Allow the instant application by granting 15 days' time to the Petitioners/Applicants in order to comply with the direction of this Hon'ble Court in its order dated 06.04.2018.* "

3. Accordingly, prayer made in the application is allowed.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants/petitioners will comply with the directions contained in the order dated 6.4.2018, latest by, 15.5.2018.

5. *Dasti.*

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~36

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6167/2011

LIFESTYLE BUILDCON (P) LTD ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shreyans Singhvi with Ms. Nayantara and Ms. Mohita, Advs.

versus

DELHI POLLUTION CONTROL COMMITTEE & ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Dayan Krishanan, Sr. Adv. with Mr. S.S. Bawa, Adv. for the applicant.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **01.05.2018**

CM. APPL. No.17507, 17575/2018

1. Mr. Krishanan, learned Senior Counsel who appears for the applicant, on instructions, says that since the main matter is coming up for hearing on 24.7.2018, the captioned applications be stood over till such date.

2. Accordingly, renotify the applications on 24.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4517/2018

NAFIS-UL-AFIIN ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. T.S. Ahuja with Mr. Varun Ahuja, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Shiva Lakshmi with Mr. Siddharth Singh, Advs. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM. APPL. No.17348/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4517/2018 & CM. APPL. No.17347/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Ms. Shiva Lakshmi accepts notice for the respondents.

4. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within four weeks from today. Rejoinder, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. In the meanwhile, learned counsel for the petitioner will place on record the order passed by the Supreme Court in the proceedings taken out by the tenant *qua* subject premises.

6. To be noted, in this proceeding the petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 18.5.2017.

6.1 By virtue of the impugned order the tenant, one, Mr. Vijay Sachdeva has been directed to deposit the rent for the period commencing from 10.9.1965 *qua* the portion of the subject property which is in his occupation, with the custodian of enemy property.

7. Renotify the matter on 11.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~34

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4515/2018 & CM. APPL. No.17345/2018

SWAROOP ROUND THE CLOCK
CONVENIENCE STORE ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

OFFICE OF THE ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER
OF POLICE & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjoy Ghose, ASC for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

At request of Mr. Ghose, renotify the matter on 4.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~31

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3611/2018

RAMA BALA ..... Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

DELHI MEDICAL COUNCIL & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM. APPL. No.17409/2018

1. Vide order dated 13.4.2018, I had issued notice only to respondent No.1 and 2. The main matter has been renotified on 31.8.2018.

2. Accordingly, the application will stand over till 31.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~24

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8699/2016

KAMAL SEHGAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jagdish, Adv.

versus

UOI AND ANRS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Abhishek Ghai, Adv. for Mr. Sanjeev Narula, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM. APPL.No.16932/2018

1. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

"To allow the petitioner to withdraw Writ Petition (Civil) No.8699/2016 with liberty to approach the Hon'ble Tribunal."

2. Accordingly, prayer as made is allowed.

3. The captioned application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) No.8699/2016

4. Accordingly, writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~56

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4543/2018 & CM. APPL. No.17603/2018

VIJAY KUMAR SINHA & ANR ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the petitioners.

2. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 7.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~83

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4594/2018

SUNIL KUMAR GUPTA & ANR ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Anju B. Gupta with Ms. Apoorva Gulati, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj with Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl. No.17756/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4594/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17755/2018

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks a short accommodation to file an affidavit vis-a-vis the person who was on the board of the defaulting company and is not a party before this Court.

3. Renotify the matter on 4.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~77

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4587/2018 & CM. APPL. No.17744/2018

MITHILESH KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vishnu Prabhakar Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Adv. for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Bhardwaj accepts notice for the respondents.

3. In view of the order that I propose to pass, Mr. Bhardwaj does not wish to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

4. The record shows that the defaulting company goes by the name: "JSB Total Broadcast Communication Private Limited" (for short "JSB"). The master data of JSB shows that at the relevant point in time, two persons were appointed on its Board of Directors, one of which was the petitioner. The other director, that is, Mr. Jesus Mantoo is not a party before this Court.

4.1 I am told by learned counsel for the petitioner that Mr. Jesus Mantoo has shown no interest in approaching this Court for relief.

5. Furthermore, counsel for the petitioner says that the petitioner is impacted with the continued inclusion of by his name in the list of disqualified directors as he is on the board of other companies, which are active and fully functional. For this purpose, my attention is drawn to page 62 of the paper book.

6. Mr. Bhardwaj, who appears for the respondents, says that the assertions of the petitioner made before this Court can be inquired into by the ROC.

6.1 I tend to agree with this submission of Mr. Bhardwaj.

7. Accordingly, writ petition is disposed of with a direction that the petitioner would appear before the ROC on 8.5.2018 at 11.00 a.m. The ROC will ascertain the correct position and thereafter, pass a speaking order. A copy of the order will be furnished to the counsel for the petitioner.

8. In case the petitioner is aggrieved by the ROC's order, he will have liberty to assail the same in the manner known to law.

9. Pending the inquiry by the ROC, the operation of the impugned list of disqualified directors will remain stayed insofar as it concerns the petitioner.

10. Furthermore, ROC will activate the petitioner's DIN and DSC. The ROC will, however, have liberty to vary or even withdraw the facility after hearing the petitioner and/or his representative, if such a situation arises.

11. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~71

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4581/2018

JAGDISH VISHNOI AND ORS. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Varun Kashyap, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner says that he will file an affidavit stating therein clearly as to the period for which the defaulting company has not carried out any business and operated any bank account.

2. Renotify the matter on 4.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~65

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4575/2018

RANBIR KAUR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Bansal with Mr. Alok Sinha, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Bhagwan Swarup Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17724/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4575/2018 & CM APP No.17723/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. At request of the Court, Mr. Shukla accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

4. In view of the order that I propose to pass, Mr. Shukla does not wish to file a counter affidavit.

5. The record shows that the defaulting company goes by the name: "Habitat Space & Infra Private Limited" (for short "HSIPL"). It is the writ petitioner's case that since HSIPL had not filed its financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law, its name was struck off from the Register of Companies.

5.1 The master data appended to the petition shows that at the given point in time, there were three Directors on the Board of HSIPL. These being: Ravi Malik, Renu Malik and the writ petitioner (Ranbir Kaur).

5.2 It appears that Ravi Malik had approached this Court by way of a writ petition being W.P.(C) No.3105/2018. This writ petition was disposed of by another learned Single Judge vide order dated 28.3.2018. By virtue of this order liberty was granted to Mr. Ravi Malik to avail of the benefits of the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 ("Scheme") in consonance with the directions contained therein.

6. Mr. Bansal, who appears for the petitioner, says that, in fact, Mr. Ravi Malik has also filed an appeal before the NCLT, which he proposes to withdraw, in view of the order dated 28.3.2018, passed by this Court. Mr. Bansal further submits that the writ petitioner had also moved an application before the NCLT for being impleaded as a party.

6.1 It is, thus, the submission of Mr. Bansal that given these circumstances, the writ petitioner's DIN and DSC be activated and her name may be excluded from the impugned list of disqualified directors, as was ordered in the case of Mr. Ravi Malik.

7. Mr. Shukla, who appears for the official respondents, on the other hand, says that the matter needs to be inquired into by the ROC.

7.1 I tend to agree with the submission of Mr. Shukla.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction that the writ petitioner would appear before the ROC on 8.5.2018 at 11.00 a.m. The ROC will ascertain the correct position and thereafter, pass a speaking order. A copy of the order, so passed, will be furnished to the counsel for the writ

petitioner.

9. In case the writ petitioner is aggrieved by ROC's order, she will have liberty to assail the same in the manner known to law.

10. Pending the inquiry by ROC, the operation of the impugned list of disqualified directors will remain stayed insofar as it concerns the writ petitioner.

11. Furthermore, the ROC will activate the Petitioner's DIN and DSC. The ROC will, however, have the liberty to vary or even withdraw the facility after hearing the writ petitioner and/or her representative, if such a situation arises.

12. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~64

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4574/2018

SHAILESH GUPTA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Navin Kumar Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Bhagwan Swarup Shukla, CGSC for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17722/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4574/2018 & CM APP No.17721/2018

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks accommodation to file an affidavit bringing on record the consent of the other Directors on the Board of the defaulting companies.

3. At his request, renotify the matter on 8.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~62

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4572/2018

RAGHVENDRA AGARWAL AND ORS ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Malik with Mr. Dhawal Sain, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17719/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4572/2018 & CM APP No.17718/2018

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks accommodation to file an affidavit bringing on record the fact that the defaulting company has not carried out any business and operated any bank account.

3. At request, renotify the matter on 3.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~37

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10374/2017

SURINDER KUMAR MADAN ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Sudhir Nagar, Adv.

versus

DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Sumit Rana, Adv. for DSIIDC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17498/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Sumit Rana accepts notice for the respondent.

3. Reply, if any, will be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify the matter on 23.7.2018.

5. In case the Estate Officer passes the final order, he will not enforce the same for a period of one week from the date the order is passed. A copy of the final order will be furnished to the petitioner.

6. *Dasti*.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~23

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

\+ W.P.(C) 885/2017 & CM APP No.4000/2017, 12602/2017

BOHRA INDUSTRIES LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Biju Mattam, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. J. Vijetha, Adv. for UOI.
Mr. Manish Kaushik with Mishal Johari, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner seeks accommodation.

2. Renotify the matter on 16.11.2018.

3. In the meanwhile, respondents will file their counter affidavits within four weeks from today.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~22

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8843/2014 & CM APP No.11396/2015

DMA NURSING HOME & MEDICAL ESTABLISHMENT FORUM ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pusshp Gupta, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Aditya Goyal, Adv. for Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC for R-1/UOI. Mr. Vishnu Mehra, Adv. for R-3/GIPSA.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **01.05.2018**

1. No time left.

2. It is already 5.45 p.m.

3. Renotify the matter on 19.11.2018.

4. In the meanwhile, the petitioner will take steps to implead the insurance companies, which form the part of respondent No.3/GIPSA.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~20 & 21

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5152/2010

DELHI JAL BOARD ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Nandita Rao, Adv.

versus

ASSISTANT COLLECTOR AND ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Naushad Ahmed Khan, ASC for GNCTD.
Ms. Biji Rajesh with Mr. Diwankar Sethi, Advs. for Mr. Gaurang Kanth, Adv. for MCD.

\+ W.P.(C) 5926/2011 & CM APP No.11986/2011

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI
THROUGH ITS COMMISSIONER ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Biji Rajesh with Mr. Diwankar Sethi, Advs. for Mr. Gaurang Kanth, Adv. for MCD.

versus

THE GNCT OF DELHI AND ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Naushad Ahmed Khan, ASC for GNCTD.
Mr. Ajjay Aroraa with Mr. Kapil Dutta, Advs. for NDMC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. I am informed that a detailed counter affidavit in W.P.(C) No.5152/2010 & W.P.(C) No.5926/2011 as directed by this Court vide order dated 24.11.2016 has not been filed by respondent No.1.

2. Respondent No.1 will do the needful within four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, will be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. Renotify the matter on 26.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/pmc

$~59

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4548/2018

VIRENDER MISHRA AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Ashish Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Dev P.Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kanishk Arora &
Ms. Anubha Bhardwaj, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17618/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4548/2018 & CM Appl.No.17617/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Skydd Technologies Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company had not carried out any

business in the last three years. Furthermore, the petitioners states that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr*.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also

furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~58

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4546/2018

ANKUSH JOHAR AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Saurabh Kalia with
Mr. Siddharth Nagpal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Vinod Diwakar, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17612/2018(exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4546/2018 & CM Appl.No.17611/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Diwakar, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Addroit Media Marketing Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company had not carried out any business since its incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on

account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not

covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~55 & 70

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4540/2018

ROHINI SAWHNEY ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Vineet Jhanji with Mr. Imran Moulaey, Mr. Pawan Sharma & Ms. Arpita Yadav, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. B.S.Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

\+ W.P.(C) 4580/2018

RISHAL SAWHNEY ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Vineet Jhanji with Mr. Imran Moulaey, Mr. Pawan Sharma & Ms. Arpita Yadav, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. B.S.Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17542/2018(exemption) in W.P.(C) 4540/2018 &
CM APP No.17733/2018(exemption) in W.P.(C) 4580/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4540/2018 & CM Appl.No.17541/2018 &
W.P.(C) 4580/2018 & CM Appl.No.17732/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petitions, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Shukla, CGSC that the issues raised

in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Boards of companies by the names: Konkan Retreat Private Limited and Hacienda Retreat Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Companies"). The petitioners state that the Companies had not carried out any business since their incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Companies' financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter “Scheme”). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of

Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition(s) will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject companies mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~53

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4538/2018

VIKRAM KHULLAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashish Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Vivekanand Mishra, Sr. Counsel for R- 1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17532/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4538/2018 & CM Appl.No.17531/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by Mr.Mishra, Sr. Counsel that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Golden Glades And Resorts Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company had not carried out any business since the last three years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on

account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not

covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~51

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4534/2018, CM APP No.17524/2018

RAHUL MALHOTRA & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Vishnu Prabhakar Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Ms. Amrita Prakash, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

W.P.(C) No.4577/2018 & CM. Appl. No.17524/2018

1. Issue notice. Mr. Amrita Prakash, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, says that he wishes to approach the NCLT for reviving company by the name: Daily Bazaar Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company").

3. To be noted, the Company was struck off from the Register of Companies by the ROC upon its failure to file the requisite financial statements and returns. The petitioners, I am told, were appointed as Directors on the Board of the Company.

4. In view of the fact that the petitioners wish to approach the NCLT to revive the Company in consonance with the provisions of Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013, the learned counsel for the official respondents

submits that the ROC will not oppose the revival provided the appeal is filed before 07.05.2018.

5. Having regard to the aforesaid, the writ petition is disposed of giving liberty to the petitioners to approach the NCLT by way of an appeal. Since the captioned Writ petition was filed on the day the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 ("Scheme") was to expire, leave is granted to the Petitioner(s) to institute the appeal with NCLT on or before 07.05.2018. Pending the decision in the appeal, there would be a stay on the operation of the list of disqualified directors insofar as it concerns the petitioners herein. Furthermore, the respondents will also activate the DIN and DSC of the petitioners.

6. Needless to say if the petitioners fail to file an appeal within the timeline given above, or fails in persuading the NCLT to revive the Company, the stay on the operation of the list of disqualified directors, insofar as it concerns the petitioners, would stand dissolved automatically with necessary consequences. This direction would also apply if the petitioners fail to take requisite steps under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (“Scheme”) after it is ordered to be revived by NCLT.

7. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
ak

$~57

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4545/2018

AVBS DIGITAL SOLUTIONS PVT LTD ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. N.S.Dalal &
Ms. Toral Banerjee, Advs.

versus

POST GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL EDUCATION & RESEARCH & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with
Mr. Siddharth Singh, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is aggrieved as the contract given to it for annual maintenance of printers, scanners, computers, laptops and fax machines has been terminated prior to its tenure coming to an end.

2. According to the petitioner, the tenure of the contract was three years i.e. from 1.4.2016 to 31.3.2019. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the contract was terminated vide communication dated 11th April, 2018, at the whim and fancy of respondent no.1

3. Issue notice.

4. Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of

the respondents. Learned counsel states that she would require time to obtain instructions.

5. Renotify the matter on 6.7.2018.

6. Counsel for the respondents will bring to the Court the original records. Furthermore, if a contract is given to a third party by the respondents the same will be subject to the outcome of the writ petition.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~60

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4567/2018

JAY POLYCHEM (INDIA) LTD. AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Dr. Ashwani Kumar & Mr. Kirti Uppal, Sr. Advs. with
Mr. Vineet Malhotra, Mr. Vishal Gohri &
Mr. Shubhanshu Kaushik, Advs.

versus

BANK OF INDIA ..... Respondent
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Issue notice to the respondent.
2. In addition, service be effected via private mode as well.
3. Renotify the matter on 26.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
ak

$~63

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4573/2018, CM APP No.17720/2018

JENENDRA MEDICOS PVT. LTD THROUGH DIRECTOR VINOD KUMAR JAIN ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. P.K.Bhardwaj, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Bharathi Raju with
Ms. J.Vijetha, Advs. for R-1 to 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Ms. Bharathi Raju, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent nos. 1 to 3.

3. Counter affidavit, if any be filed within three weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Any steps taken hereafter by the respondents will be subject to the final outcome of the writ petition.

5. Renotify on 15th November, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
ak

$~78

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4588/2018

KHAITAN CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS LTD
..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vineet Malhotra, Adv

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr. Brajesh Kumar &
Mr. Waize Ali, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Adverse orders are deferred.

2. Mr. Kirtiman Singh, learned counsel who appears for the respondents states that he will take instructions in the meanwhile.

3. Renotify on 6th July, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

At this stage, Mr. Vineet Malhotra, learned counsel for the petitioner enters appearance. He is apprised of the order passed today.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~85

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4597/2018, CM No.17761/2018

SANJAY SACHDEVA & ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Kunal Sabharwal, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kanishk Arora, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: MGRS Promoters Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company had not carried out any business in the last four years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated

21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~86

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4598/2018, CM No.17762/2018

ASHUTOASH RASTOGI & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ashish Middha, Adv.

versus

MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kanishk Arora, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: CLS Marketing Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company had not carried out any business since incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the

aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not

covered by the Division Bench judgment.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~87

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4599/2018, CM No.17763/2018

RITU RASTOGI & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ashish Middha, Adv.

versus

MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kanishk Arora, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Optima Wellness Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company was not carrying out business since its incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the

aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not

covered by the Division Bench judgment.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~88

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4600/2018, CM No.17764/2018

ARVIND SHARMA & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Pandey, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kanishk Arora, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Kazen – Servicemart Services & Sales Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company had not carried out any business in the last three years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated

21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~90

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4604/2018

AMIT SHARMA ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Mohit Gupta, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with
Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Adv. for R-1 to 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17769/2018(exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4604/2018 & CM Appl.No.17768/2018

2. At request of learned counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 7.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~89

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4601/2018, CM APP No.17765/2018

MANOJ CHANDRA MISHRA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Pandey, Adv.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kanishk Arora &
Ms. Anubha Bhardwaj, Advs. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Dev P.Bhardwaj, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Mr. Bhardwaj does not wish to file a counter affidavit in the matter in view of the directions I intend to pass.

3. The defaulting company in this case is Lords & Knights Hospitality Services Private Ltd. (LKPL). According to the petitioner the name of LKPL was struck off from the Register of the Companies on account of failure to file financial statements and statutory returns.

3.1 Resultantly, the petitioner along with other two persons who were appointed as Directors on the Board of LKPL attracted disqualification.

3.2 The list of disqualified directors which is appended at page 16 of the paper book shows the name of the petitioner and the other two directors i.e. Mr. Gagnish Arora and Mr. Tapan Thakur.

4. Counsel for the petitioner states that Mr. Gagnish Arora has resigned from LKPL and that Mr. Tapan Thakur had expired. Unfortunately, neither the resignation nor the death certificate has been placed on record.

5. Given these circumstances, Mr. Bhardwaj states that matter could be remitted to the ROC for necessary enquiry.

5.1 I tend to agree with submission made by Mr. Bhardwaj.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:

i) The petitioner will appear before the ROC on 10th May, 2018 at 11.00 am.

ii) Upon the petitioner producing the resignation letter and the death certificate pertaining to persons referred to above, the ROC will consider the request of the petitioner for excluding his name from the impugned list of disqualified directors.

iii) Furthermore, if a request is made for activation of DIN and DSC, the same will also be considered by the ROC. The ROC will pass a speaking order; a copy of which will be furnished to the petitioner. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved, he will have liberty to assail the same in the manner known to law.

7. The writ petition, along with all pending applications, is disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

8. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~33

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4512/2018

KAPIL GARG ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sima Gulati with Ms. Ridhima Gulati & Ms. Revati Gulati, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. B.S.Shukla, CGSC for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17340/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. B.S.Shukla, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Mr. Shukla states that he does not wish to file a reply in the matter in view of the directions I intend to pass.

3 The record shows that the petitioner had approached this Court in the first instance by way of writ petition bearing No.11709/2017. This petition was disposed of by order dated 2nd January, 2018. By virtue of the said order, the ROC was directed to carry out an enquiry as to whether the petitioner had acted as a director since 28.11.2011 qua the subject company.

3.1 To be noted, it was the petitioner's stand that he had resigned from the subject company on 28.11.2011 and that he had transferred his shares in favour of one, Mr. P.K. Jain, the husband of Ms. Shriya Jain, the person who was appointed as a Director on the Board of the subject company.

4. A perusal of the impugned order shows that the ROC did not call

upon Ms. Shriya Jain to give her version of events while ascertaining as to whether or not the petitioner had acted as Director of the subject company after 28.11.2011.

4.1 The ROC, in my opinion, given the circumstances obtaining in the case ought to have called upon Ms. Shriya Jain to explain her stand in the matter.

5. Given these circumstances, the impugned order is set aside. The matter is remanded to the ROC for a fresh enquiry.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is a Director on the Board of other companies which are active and fully functional and the continued inclusion of the petitioner's name in the list of disqualified directors is impacting his functionality qua such companies. For this purpose my attention is drawn to Annexure B. Unfortunately, the master data of companies referred to in Annexure B has not been placed before the Court.

6.1 Therefore, in case the petitioner files an affidavit with the ROC bringing to light this fact, the ROC will be authorized to activate the DIN and DSC of the petitioner after he has ascertained the correct facts qua this aspect of the matter.

6.2 The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

7. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~32

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4503/2018

M/S RAMESH CHAND GUPTA AND SONS ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Pardeep Gupta with
Mr. Parinav Gupta, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Ramesh Singh, Standing counsel
with Mr. Chirayu Jain, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM Appl.No.17308 & 17309/2018(exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

2. Applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4503/2018 & CM Appl.No.17310/2018

3. Mr. Pardeep Gupta who appears for the petitioners seeks leave to withdraw the captioned writ petition and the application with liberty to challenge the cancellation order which the respondents have passed in the meanwhile. It is to be noted this writ petition had been filed to quash the suspension order.

4. The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

5. Dasti.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~30

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3358/2018

SHAQIQ MOHD KHAN AND ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Saurabh Kalia, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Ms. Amrita Prakash, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17291/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Ms. Amrita Prakash, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Mr. Prakash states that she does not oppose the prayer made in the application. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *"A. Allow the instant application by granting 15 days' time to the Petitioners/Applicants in order to comply with the directions of this Hon'ble Court in its order dated 06.04.2018;"*

3. For the reasons given in this application, time is granted to the applicant/petitioner no.1 to comply with the directions contained in the order dated 6.4.2018 till 15th May, 2018.

4. The application is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

5. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~29

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2995/2018

MANOJ KUMAR AND ANR ..... Petitioners
Through:

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj with
Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Advs. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17268/2018

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the applicants/petitioners. The application made seeks only extension of time for deposit of FDR with the Registrar General of this court.

2. Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, learned counsel for the respondents, says he has no objection to the prayer made in the application. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:-

> *"a) extend the time granted for deposit the said FDR with Registrar of High Court in the interest of justice;"*

3. Accordingly, the prayer made in the application is allowed.

4. The applicants/petitioners are given time till 15th May, 2018 to deposit the FDR with the Registrar General of this Court. The application is disposed of accordingly.

5. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~28

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2901/2018

AKASH GOEL & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Sougat Sinha, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Vinod Diwakar, CGSC for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17415/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Vinod Diwakar, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

3. This is an application which seeks extension of time to comply with the order dated 23rd March, 2018. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *"a) Pass an order to allow time to the petitioner to do the compliance of order dated 23.03.2018 by 7th May, 2018 or any other period as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit"*

4. For the reasons given therein the prayer made is allowed. The application is disposed of accordingly.

5. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~27

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2484/2018

LUBNA SADAF & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Siddhanth Shankar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. B.S.Shukla, CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17298/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. B.S.Shukla, learned CGSC accepts notice at the request of the Court, on behalf of the official respondents.

3. This is an application which, in effects, seeks condonation of delay in complying with the order dated 22nd March, 2018. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *"a) Condone the delay of 19 days in depositing the FDR of an amount of Rs.30,000/-, with the Registry of this Hon'ble Court, on behalf of the petitioners, in terms of order dated 22nd March, 2018; and"*

4. For the reasons given therein the prayer made is allowed. The application is disposed of accordingly.

5. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~26

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1485/2018

RAHUL GOEL & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Bhagat, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Vijay Joshi, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Anil Dabas, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17408/2018

1. This is an application which, in effect, seeks modification of the order dated 16.2.2018, passed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru.

2. Place the matter before the same Bench, subject to the orders of the Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice on 3rd May, 2018.

3. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
ak

$~25

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9799/2017

ASHIM SARAF & ORS ..... Petitioners
Through: Ms. Reena Choudhary, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Ajay Digpaul, CGSC with
Ms. Madhuri Dhingra, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17352/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Ajay Digpaul, learned CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Mr. Digpaul states that he does not oppose the prayer made in the application. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *"a) Pass an order/direction permitting the Petitioners to make the deposits with the Registry of this Hon'ble Court in the form of FDRs in compliance with its order dated 22.03.2018, within a period of one day from the date of receipt of this Hon'ble Court's order in the present Application."*

3. For the reasons given therein the prayer made is allowed. The application is disposed of accordingly.

4. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
ak

$~7

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5653/2015, CM APP No. 10179/2015

M/S SURYA PHARMACEUTICAL LIMITED ..... Petitioner
Through: Ms. Shikha Sapra, with
Mr. Abhinav Jain, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, CGSC with
Mr. Abhigyan Siddhant, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that she has not received any instructions from the petitioner despite having sent several communications in that behalf. Consequently, the petitioner seeks discharge. Let an application be moved in that behalf. The application will be accompanied by communication(s) sent to the petitioner in that regard.

2. In the meanwhile, issue Court notice to the petitioner.

3. Renotify the matter on 16th November, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
ak

$~50

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4532/2018

ARUN KAPOOR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kumar Dev Sharma with
Mr. Mani Dev Sharma, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Dev P.Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kanishk Arora &
Ms. Anubha Bhardwaj, Advs. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17521/2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the defaulting company i.e. Tarz Support Services Private Ltd. had on its Board two Directors i.e. the writ petitioner herein (Mr. Arun Kapoor) and another person by the name of Mr. Sachin Dev Sharma.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that after Mr. Sachin Dev Sharma took steps to avail of the benefit of the CODS-2018 his name was removed from the impugned list of disqualified directors. It is stated that insofar as the petitioner is concerned, his name has not been excluded from the said list.

3. Mr. Kanishk who appears for the official respondents states that he will obtain instructions in the matter.

4. List on 4th May, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~49

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4527/2018

MAYA CAROLI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Malik with
Mr. Dhawal Jain, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gogna,
CGSC for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17512/2018(exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4527/2018 & CM APP No.17511/2018

3. Issue notice.

4. Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gogna, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. In view of the order, I propose to pass the order Mr. Gogna states that he does not wish to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

5. The petitioner claims to have been appointed as the director on the Board of Dynagro (India) Private Ltd. and Gummi Metall Technik (India) Private Ltd. [in short "GMT India"].

6 It is the assertion of the petitioner that while her name has been put in the list of disqualified directors for financial year 2012-2014 by the ROC in exercise of powers under Section 164(2)(a), Companies Act, 2013, the subject company i.e. GMT (India) continues to be shown as an active and fully functional entity.

5.1 For this purpose my attention has been drawn to page 37 of the paper book.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that insofar as GMT (India) is concerned, there is dispute with regard to management of the same which is pending adjudication, at present, now before this Court in the form of an appeal, numbered as : Co.A(SB)38/2012.

6.1 As a matter of fact, my attention has also been drawn in this behalf to the assertions made in para 7 at page 11 of the writ petition.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the assertions made in the writ petition, the writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

i) The petitioner will appear on her own or via her authorized representative before the ROC on 10th May, 2018 at 11.00 am.

ii) The ROC, after having the petitioner and/or her authorized representative will pass the speaking order.

iii) The ROC, will ascertain as to whether the claim made by the petitioner that there obtains a management dispute is correct or not.

iv) The ROC, will also rule as to whether in these circumstances and, especially, given the fact that GMT (India) is shown as an

active and fully functional company, the petitioner's name ought to be included in the list of disqualified directors.

v) Pending conclusion of the aforesaid enquiry insofar as the petitioner is concerned, the operation of list of disqualified directors will remain stayed. Furthermore, the petitioner's DIN and DSC will be re-activated by the ROC. It is further made clear that the ROC will have the authority to vary or withdraw the facility if the situation so demands.

8. Accordingly the all pending applications shall stand closed.

9. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~47

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4525/2018, CM APP Nos.17499-500/2018

PRAVEEN GUPTA & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.K.B.Soni, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Gaugang Kanth, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks to withdraw the petition with liberty to take recourse to an appropriate remedy vis-a-vis defaulting company i.e. Ganapati Shelters Private Ltd.

2. The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
ak

$~46

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4412/2018, CM APP Nos.17130-17132/2018

ANIL KUMAR BAJAJ ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Siddharth Mehta, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with
Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No.17131/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Vivek Goyal, learned CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *"(a) Allow the Petitioners herein to file their returns under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 till 10th May 2018."*

3. For the reasons given in the application, the prayer made therein is allowed. The applicant/petitioner will comply with the directions contained in the order by 15th May, 2018. The application is disposed of accordingly.

4. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~45

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4036/2018

OUR LADY OF HEALTH VAILANKANNI SOUTH INDIAN BHAJANA SABHA ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Harpreet Kaur &
Mr. Alakh Alok Srivastava, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Gigi C. George with
Mr. Amit Dogra, Advs. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17497/2018

1. This is an application seeking leave to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to file a fresh writ petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that an eviction order has been passed which needs to be challenged. Accordingly, the application is allowed.

W.P.(C) 4036/2018

3. The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~44

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3602/2018

NARENDRA KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anshuman Sahni, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with
Mr. Sidhant Singh, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17641/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, learned CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. The counsel states that she does not wish to file a reply to the application. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *"a) Allow the application in favour of the petitioner and extend the time to comply with Order dated 13.4.2018 and direct the Registrar General to accept the Demand Draft No.309485 dated 25.04.2018 on behalf of Lancers Security Solutions Pvt. Ltd. in pursuance of Order dated 13.04.2018."*

3. For the reasons given in the application, the prayer made therein is allowed. The applicant/petitioner will comply with the directions contained in order dated 13th April, 2018 on or before 15th May, 2018. The application is disposed of accordingly.

4. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~42

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3022/2018

KUMAR SAMAR & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Counsel for the petitioner.
(Appearance not given)

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC
with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17222/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, learned CGSC, accepts notice at the request of the Court, on behalf of the official respondents. The substantive prayers made in the application are as follows:

> *"(a) Condone the delay of 20 days in Complying with order dated 23.03.2018 of Hon'ble Court*
>
> *(b) Grant one-week time to the Applicants/Petitioners to submit FDR and to avail the benefit of Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018."*

3. For the reasons given in the application, the prayers (a) and (b) are allowed. The applicants/petitioners are given time till 8th May, 2018 to comply with the directions issued by this Court for deposit of FDR and to avail of the benefit of CODS-2018 The application is disposed of accordingly.

4. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~41

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2997/2018

DHANENDRA KUMAR JAIN AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Aditya Nayyar with Mr. Sahil Gupta & Mr. Hetish Raj Singh, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj with Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Advs. for R- 1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17503/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Mr. Bhardwaj states that he does not wish to file a reply. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *"a) extend the time granted for deposit the said FDR with Registrar of High Court in the interest of justice."*

3. For the reasons given in the application, the prayer made therein is allowed. The applicants/petitioners are given time till 15th May, 2018 to place on record the FDR in terms of the directions issued by this Court. The application is disposed of accordingly.

4. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~40

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2996/2018

PRADEEP DALMIA AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Aditya Nayyar with Mr. Sahil Gupta & Mr. Hetish Raj Singh, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj with Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Advs. for R- 1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17496/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Mr. Bhardwaj states that he does not wish to file a reply. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *a) extend the time granted for deposit the said FDR with Registrar of High Court in the interest of justice;*

3. For the reasons given in the application, the prayer made therein is allowed. The applicants/petitioners are given time till 15th May, 2018 to place on record the FDR in terms of the directions issued by this Court. The application is disposed of accordingly.

4. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~39

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2959/2018

HARPREET SINGH CHHABBA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gursat Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Digpaul with
Ms. Madhuri Dhingra, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. 17667/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Ajay Digpaul, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Mr. Digpaul states that he does not wish to file a reply. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *"a) Delay of 20 days in depositing the amount as per the order dated 23.03.2018 in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt is condoned and the Fixed Deposit Receipt along with calculation sheet is taken on record."*

3. For the reasons given in the application, the prayer made therein is allowed. The application is disposed of accordingly.

4. The original FDRs along with the calculation sheet will be taken on record by the Registry.

5. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/ak

$~38

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1478/2018

KAMINI DHUPAR AND ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Awnish Kumar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Jitesh Vikram Srivastava, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

CM APP No. No.17665/2018

1. Mr.Awnish Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks short accommodation to file an additional affidavit with regard to whether or not the third director on the Board of the subject company has accorded consent to avail of benefit of CODS-2018.

2. At request, renotify the matter on 8th May, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
ak

$~98

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4617/2018

MAHENDRA SURANA & ORS ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi with Ms. Preeti Kumra and Mr. Raj Rishi, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC and Mr. Kamaldeep, Advocate for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Aptive IT Solutions Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by

this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C)

9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018

$~93

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4610/2018

MUKESH GARG AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Manmohan Shringirishi, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Amrita Prakash, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

2. Issue notice. Ms. Amrita Prakash, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, says that he wishes to approach the NCLT for reviving company by the name: SRG Propmart Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company").

4. To be noted, the Company was struck off from the Register of Companies by the ROC upon its failure to file the requisite financial statements and returns. The petitioners, I am told, were appointed as Directors on the Board of the Company.

5. In view of the fact that the petitioners have approached the NCLT to revive the Company in consonance with the provisions of Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013, the learned counsel for the official respondents submits that the ROC will not oppose the revival.

6. To be noted, the captioned Writ petition was filed on the day the

Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 ("Scheme") was to expire. Therefore, this writ petition is disposed of with the direction that pending the decision in the appeal, there would be a stay on the operation of the list of disqualified directors insofar as it concerns the petitioners herein. Furthermore, the respondents will also activate the DIN and DSC of the petitioners.

7. Needless to say if the petitioners fail in persuading the NCLT to revive the Company, the stay on the operation of the list of disqualified directors, insofar as it concerns the petitioners, would stand dissolved automatically with necessary consequences.

8. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~94

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4611/2018

CHURCHIT SADH AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Siddharth Sharma and Ms. Charu Tyagi, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC with Mr. A. Kumar, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Churchit International Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company was not carrying out business, and that they were planning to liquidate the Company. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners

aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not

covered by the Division Bench judgment.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018

$~95

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4612/2018

MR. KUNAL JAIDKA AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Hetish Raj Singh, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC and Mr. Kamaldeep, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

C.M. NO.17820/2018(Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

WP(C) No. 4612/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Land Kraft Consulting Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under

the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official

respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018

$~91

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4605/2018

SANDEEP KANSAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohit Gupta, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Advocate for R-1,2 & 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Alpine Advanced Education Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company had not carried out any business since incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated

21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union f India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~4

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5292/2014

SNEH LATA JAIN & ORS. ... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajeshwar Kr. Gupta, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Monika Arora, CGSC for UOI.
Mr. Sanjay Dewan and Ms. Palak, Advocates for R-2.
Mr. Rahul Sharma and Mr. C.K. Bhatt, Advocates for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners seeks accommodation. The request is not opposed by Ms. Arora, who appears for respondents.

2. Renotify the matter on 8.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
Cks

$~92

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4607/2018

SURAN SINGH AND ORS ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Anupradha Singh, Advocate.

versus

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, ASC/GNCTD and Ms. Deboshree Mukherjee, Advocate for R-1, 3 & 4.
Mr. Parvinder Chauhan and Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocates for R-2/DUSIB.
Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Ms. Anupradha Singh, who appears for petitioners, claims that the petitioners, who are living in hutments in the subject area have been residing there, for nearly 40 years. It is stated that the impugned order of eviction has been passed contrary to the judgments of this Court rendered in *Sudama Singh v. Govt. of Delhi*, (2010 SCC OnLine Del) and *PK Paul v. Estates Officer & Anr.*, (2010 SCC OnLine Del 4207).

2. This apart, counsel for the petitioners says that very short time have been given to evacuate from the subject area.

3. Mr. Chauhan, who appears for respondent no.2/DUSIB, says

that the said respondent has no intimation with regard to the impugned action being taken by respondent no.1/PWD.

4. Issue notice.

4.1 Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, accepts notice for respondent no.1/PWD.

4.2 Likewise, Mr. Shukla, accepts notice for respondent no.3 & 4.

5. Counter affidavit(s) be filed within two weeks from today.

6. Rejoinder, thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

7. Respondents will maintain status-quo as to the possession *vis-a-vis* the petitioners till further orders are passed in the matter.

8. Renotify the matter on 17.8.2018.

9. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~96

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4613/2018

MR. VINOD GOYAL ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Hetish Raj Singh, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Gigi C. George, Sr. Panel Counsel for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner seeks accommodation to file an affidavit of other directors on the Board of the defaulting company.

2. At request, renotify the matter on 8.05.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~97

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4614/2018

PENGYU DONG & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi and Ms. Preeti Kumra, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC and Mr. Kamaldeep, Advocate for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner seeks accommodation to file an affidavit.

2. At request renotify the matter on 8.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~16

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3883/2017

UNITY-TRIVENI-BCPL (JV) ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Kiran Suri, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Hitendra Nath Rathi, Advocate.

versus

RAIL VIKAS NIGAM LTD. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Udit Seth, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. At request, renotify the matter on 16.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~1

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7454/2012

JOERG BOETHLING ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sharmila Upadhyay, Mr. Rajesh, Mr. Rajeev and Ms. Meenakshi Rawat, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Varsha Poddar, Advocate for R-1.
Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. No time left.

2. It is already 4.55 PM.

3. To be noted Mr. Kirtiman Singh says that he will file an additional affidavit.

4. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify the matter on 15.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3451/2014

DI SPUN PIPE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Aakash Bajaj and Mr. Bharat Gupta, Advocates.

versus

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARD AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Samraat Singh, Advocate for R-1. Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, Advocate for R-2 & 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioners says that rejoinder was filed, today, with the registry vide Diary No.13398.

2. A copy of the same has been furnished to the counsel for the respondents.

3. At request, renotify the matter on 20.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2588/2015

VIJAY KUMAR SHARMA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. A.N. Singh, Mr. A.K. Mishra, Mr. B.N. Mishra and Mr. S.K. Mishra, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mrs. Suparna Srivastava, CGSC with Mr. Tushar Mathur and Ms. Sanjna Dua, Advocates for R-1 & 2.
Ms. Meenakshi Singh, Advocate for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner says that since the petitioner has received the money, he has instructions not to press the writ petition.

2. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed as not pressed, in view of the above submission made by the counsel for the petitioner.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~8

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6523/2015

JHUGGI JHOMPRI EKTA MANCH (REGD.) & ANR..... Petitioners

Through: Counsel (appearance not given)

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Counsel (appearance not given)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. I am told that except for respondent no.7, the remaining respondents have not filed their counter affidavits. A perusal of the order dated 5.5.2017 would show that 4 weeks were granted to file the counter affidavits, failing which a sum of Rs.10,000/- each was to be paid as costs to the petitioner.

2. Sadly, the counter affidavits have still not been filed. Since, the remaining respondents seek further time to file counter affidavits, they will pay additional costs of Rs.5000/- each. Let the needful be done within four weeks from today. If counter affidavits are not filed, the opportunity to file counter affidavit(s) shall stand closed.

3. In any case, counter affidavits will not be taken on record unless proof of payment of costs is placed on record.

4. The respondents will ensure that the costs are distributed pro rata amongst persons, whose names are given in the list of members

in Annexure P-1 at page 38 of the paper book.

5. Renotify the matter on 26.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~9

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6738/2015

RAJNI SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Rajni Singh (petitioner in person)

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mrs. Suparna Srivastava, CGSC with Mr. Tushar Mathur, Advocate for R1. Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal and Ms. Rupali Samuel, Advocates for R-3 & 4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. No time left.
2. It is already 5.00 PM.
3. Renotify the matter on 11.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~10

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7690/2015

DAL CHAND MEMORIAL EDUCATION SOCIETY (R) & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC/GNCTD and Ms. Mahamaya Chatergee, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioners.

2. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 27.11.2018.

4. In the meanwhile, the petitioner will have liberty to file a rejoinder in the matter.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~11

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9562/2016

DHRUV FILMS ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sumit Chander and Mr. Jatin Choudhary, Advocates.

versus

DD URDU DOORDARSHAN AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajeev Sharma and Ms. Radhalakshmi, Advocates for R-1 & 2.

Ms. Arti Bansal and Mr. Ashutosh Nandan Atrey, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Mr. Rajeev Sharma, who appears for respondent nos. 1 and 2, seeks further time to file a counter affidavit.

2. The request is acceded to subject to payment of costs of Rs.5000/-. The counter affidavit will be filed within 2 weeks from today.

3. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify the matter on 28.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/cks

$~12

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10819/2016

UNION OF INDIA ..... Petitioner

Through: Dr. Indra Pratap Singh, Advocate.

versus

MANISH KUMAR ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the respondents.
2. Adverse orders are deferred.
3. Renotify the matter on 29.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~13

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

\+ W.P.(C) 644/2017

JAGVIR SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh, Proxy Counsel for Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate.

versus

DELHI MEDICAL COUNCIL & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Praveen Khattar, Advocate for R-1/DMC.
Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Advocate for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Mr. Khattar, who appears for respondent no.1/DMC, seeks and is granted further 4 weeks time to file a counter affidavit.

2. The request is acceded to subject to the payment of costs of Rs.5000/- to the petitioner.

3. Ms. Kaur, who, now appears for respondents no.2 to 5, seeks further two weeks to file a counter affidavit as there was delay caused due to change in counsel.

4. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within 4 weeks from today.

5. Renotify the matter on 30.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~14

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1362/2017

ASSOCIATION FOR REHABILITATION UNDER NATIONAL TRUST INITIATIVE OF MARKETING ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Advocate for R-1.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Aeweena Sharma and Ms. Shruti Pandey, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Request for accommodation is made on behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

2. The request is not opposed by the counsel for the respondents.

3. Renotify the matter on 29.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~15

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2328/2017

MANMEET SINGH GULATI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Varun Mishra, Advocate.

versus

FOREIGN INVESTMENT PROMOTION BOARD (FIPB) ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Jyoti Dutt Sharma and Mr. C.K. Bhatt, Advocates for FIPB.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner says that he will take steps to implead the Union of India as a party to the proceedings.

2. To be noted, Union of India can be sued, in these proceedings, only through the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas, in view of the fact that FIPB has been dissolved.

3. Let the needful be done within 4 weeks from today.

4. Renotify the matter on 4.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9109/2017

SNEHA SAWAI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abir Phukan, Ms. Anitha Mathai Muthirenthy and Ms. Sonali Jain, Advocates.

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. K.S. Parihar and Mr. Kuldeep S. Parihar, Advocates for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **01.05.2018**

CM. APPL.39578/2017

1. This is an application filed to seek review of the order dated 16.10.2017, passed by Hon'ble Ms. Justice Indermeet Kaur. Hon'ble Ms. Justice Indermeet Kaur has, since then, retired. It is the assertion of the petitioner that there are errors in the order dated 16.10.2017. It is contended in this behalf that certain factual assertions have not been correctly recorded.

2. According to the petitioner, it was her case before the Court that her husband, one, Mr. Anshul Jain had forged her signatures on the loan documents issued by respondent no.2 and based on the forged documents, moneys were remitted by respondent no.2 to the

petitioner's salary account.

3. The petitioner claims that these moneys were withdrawn by Mr. Anshul Jain and transferred to his own account.

3.1 In sum, the petitioner was aggrieved not only by the act of forgery but also by the fact that she could not be called upon to bear the burden of the liability owed to respondent no.2.

4. The petitioner claims that a criminal complaint was lodged, once, this aspect was discovered.

5. It is also the petitioner's case that contrary to what has been recorded in the order dated 16.10.2017, she never held an account with respondent no.2.

6. Mr. Parihar appears on behalf of respondent no.1/RBI.

7. There is, however, no representation on behalf of respondent no.2.

8. Given the aforementioned circumstances, the application is disposed of with the direction that the order dated 16.10.2017 will not come in the way of the criminal proceedings initiated by the petitioner or any other proceedings that she may take out against her husband i.e., Mr. Anshul Jain or, any other party.

9. This direction is not opposed by Mr. Parihar. Learned counsel informs me that pursuant to the order dated 16.10.2017, the petitioner's representation has been disposed of.

9.1 This fact is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioner.

10. Needless to say, the concerned court would frame its own view with regard to the assertions made by the petitioner before it.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018/cks

$~18

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3265/2018

BHARAT BHUSHAN KATARIA ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Aditi Kharpate, Advocate.

versus

ANITA VASHISHT AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Jasmeet Singh, CGSC with Mr. Aditya Madaan, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 01.05.2018

1. Counsels for the respondents seek and is granted four (4) weeks to file the counter affidavit.

2. The petitioner's counsel will ensure that the entire set of the paper book is furnished to the counsel for respondent no.1.

3. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Interim order dated 5.4.2018 will continue to operate, in the meanwhile.

5. Renotify the matter on 27.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 01, 2018
cks

$~8

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6874/2015 & C.M. Appl. No.12578/2015, 12579/2015 & 12330/2017

SIR SYYD EDUCATIONAL & SOCIAL WELFARE SOCIETY

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Sabir Hussain, Adv.

versus

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT, NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ankur Jain, Adv for DUSIB.
Mr. G.D. Mishra, Standing Counsel for R-2/EDM.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 The petitioner claims to be an educational and social welfare society. It is the petitioner's case that it is running a school and for that purpose, an application has been made to the Director of Education on 07.02.1999 for allotment of land. The petitioner avers that while other similarly circumstanced entities have been allotted land, the same treatment has not been meted out to it. In support of its submission, reliance is placed on the document marked Annexure P-31, at page 120 of the paper book.

2 Mr. Ankur Jain, who, appears on behalf of DUSIB says that DUSIB came into existence only in 2004 and before that date, allotment of land for the said purpose, if at all, was made by DDA. It is also the contention of the counsel for DUSIB that at present,

DUSIB has no policy in place for allotment of land.

3 Having regard to the submissions advanced before me by the learned counsel for the petitioner, DUSIB is directed to file an affidavit placing its stand on record. In the affidavit, DUSIB will, *inter alia*, deal with the stand of the petitioner that since the application was made in 1999, why should land not be allotted to it as was done in the case of those entities whose names have been given in Annexure P-31.

4 The affidavit will be filed within six weeks from today.

5 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

6 Renotify the matter on 12.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~9

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11723/2015

RAM AVTAR & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Samrat Jasra, Adv.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC for GNCTD with Ms. Mahamaya Chatterjee, Adv.
Ms.Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with Mr. Siddharth Singh, Advs for R-3 & R-4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC says that he will furnish another copy of the counter affidavit.

2 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3 In the meanwhile, respondents No. 3 & 4 will also file their counter affidavit within four weeks.

4 Renotify the matter on 25.09.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~11

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7412/2016

PARAMJIT WALIA

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Adv.

versus

ORIENTAL BANK OF COMMERCE & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Pranav Sharma, Adv for R-1 & R-4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl No.17861/2018

1 This is an application filed by the petitioner to bring certain additional facts on record.

2 Learned counsel for the respondents seeks time to file a reply.

3 Accordingly issue notice.

4 Let reply be filed within four weeks.

5 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

6 Renotify the matter on 04.09.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~13

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

\+ W.P.(C) 534/2017 & C.M. Appl. No.2437/2017

M/S. CAPTAIN GUMAN SINGH & SONS & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through Ms. Kriti Malik and Mr. Faizi Saif, Advs.

versus

M/S. INDIAN OIL CORPORATION

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Divjyot Singh and Ms.Avsi Sharma, Advs

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Request for accommodation is made on behalf of counsel for the petitioner on the ground that he is in some personal difficulty.

2 Request is not opposed by the learned counsel for the respondent.

3 Accordingly, renotify the matter on 29.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~14

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2005/2017

BADAR SAMDHANI AND ORS ..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Molvi Aijaz Hussain, Adv.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Devesh Singh, ASC with Ms. Shukriti, Adv for R-1, R-5 & R-7.
Ms. Deepika V.Marwaha and Ms. Raunika Johar, Advs for R-2.
Mr. Abhinav with Mr. Hashmat Nabi, Advs for R-6.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl...../2018 (to be numbered)

1 This is an application filed by respondent No.2 for condonation of delay in filing the counter affidavit. This application is not numbered. The Registry is directed to number the application.

2 For the reasons stated in the application, delay in filing the counter affidavit is condoned. The Registry will, now, formally take on record the counter affidavit of respondent No.2.

2.1 A copy of the counter affidavit will be furnished to the petitioner.

3 In the meanwhile, the petitioner will be at liberty to file a rejoinder in the matter.

4 Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 2005/2017

5 Renotify the matter on 30.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~16

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5430/2017 & C.M. Appl. No.22861/2017

DR HEMANT TEWARI ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Abhijat, Mr. Maurya Vijay Chandra, Ms. Dakshaa Arora, Mr. Shaashwat Jindal, Mr.Kapil Kher and Mr. Abhishek Shukla, Advs.

versus

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Vikas Singh, Sr. Adv with Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr. Tarun Verma and Mr. Abhijit Chakrauvarty, Advocataes for MCI.

Mr.Abhishek Swaroop, Adv for R-2 & R-3.

Mr. Praveen Khattar with Mr. Bapi Das, Advs with Mr. Uppal, Assistant Secretary for DMS.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Mr. Swaroop who appears for respondents No. 2 & 3 seeks and is granted two weeks time to file a counter affidavit.

2 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3 Mr. Abhijat says that the additional affidavit has been placed on record.

4 Renotify the matter on 05.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6145/2017 & C.M. Appl. No.25564/2017

NEVIN KISHORE

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Kapil Kher, Adv.

versus

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Vikas Singh, Sr. Adv with Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr. Tarun Verma and Mr. Abhijit Chakrauvarty, Advocataes for MCI.
Mr. Praveen Khattar with Mr. Bapi Das, Advs with Mr. Uppal, Assistant Secretary for DMS.
Mr.Abhishek Swaroop, Adv for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Mr.Swaroop who appears for respondent No. 3 seeks and is granted two weeks time to file a counter affidavit.

2 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3 Renotify the matter on 05.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~20

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2506/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.10404/2018

RAJ SINGH & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through Mr.Tushant, Advocate.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Anupam Srivastava, ASC with Ms. Shreya Mehta, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 The substantive prayers made in the writ petition are as follow:-

"a. Admit the writ petition;

b. Pass a writ / order / direction in the nature of mandamus thereby directing the respondent not to take any action qua the property of the petitioners bearing no.F-335, khasra no.326 village Lado Sarai, New Delhi by demolishing the same, without affording opportunity of being heard;

2 On the previous date i.e. 16.03.2018 notice was issued in the petition and while issuing notice following order was passed:-

" The petitioners' only apprehension is that coercive measures may be taken against the subject property without hearing them. Learned counsel for the petitioners says that if such a step is taken

then it will be contrary to the order of the Division Bench dated 24.2.2015, passed in LPA No.694/2014.

3. It appears that the petitioners have filed objections with the SDM/RA, Saket, New Delhi. A copy of the objections is appended as Annexure P-8 at page 76 of the paper book.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners says, albeit, based on the revenue record that petitioners are the owners of the property which is located in Khasra No.326, Village Lado Sarai, District Delhi. For this purpose, my attention has been drawn to Annexure P-2 at pages 31 to 34 of the paper book. The petitioners claim that their predecessor in interest is, one, Mr. Risal Singh, son of Mohar Chand.

5. While entries in the revenue record do not establish title, the petitioners may have something to say qua the aspect concerning their right to be heard before any coercive measures are taken qua the subject property.

6. Issue notice. Mr. Anupam Srivastava, ASC accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

7. Mr. Anupam will revert with instructions.

8. Renotify the matter on 2.5.2018.

9. In case the instructions are received to resist the petition, the counter affidavit will be filed before the next date of hearing.

10. Till the next date of hearing, no coercive measure will be taken against the petitioners.

11. Dasti."

3 Mr. Anupam Srivastava, ASC who appears on behalf of the respondent has stated that a decision has been taken to grant personal

hearing to the petitioners on 09.05.2018 at 11:00 AM. Copy of the affidavit has been placed before me.

4 Petitioners' counsel has also been furnished a copy of the said notice which is dated 01.05.2018.

5 In these circumstances, in my view, nothing survives in the petition as the limited prayer of the petitioners is that they be heard in the matter.

6 In view of the decision taken by the SDM, Saket, no further orders are called for in the petition.

7 The writ petition is accordingly closed.

8 All pending applications shall also stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~21

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6705/2014 & C.M. Appl. Nos.11992/2015, 11993/2015,21820/2015, 2280/2016, 7934/2016, 21667/2017 & 40333/2017

K.R. CHITRA

..... Petitioner

Through Petitioner in person with Ms. Chitra Srivastava, Advocate.

versus

ADVOCATES WELFARE FUND TRUSTEE COMMITTEE & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ashish Tiwari, Adv for BCI.
Mr. Devesh Dubey for Mr. Naushad Ahmad Khan, ASC for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Ms. Srivastava has placed before me a Notification dated 26.12.2017, issued by the Department of Law, Justice and Legislative Affairs, Government of NCT of Delhi. This Notification sets out the names of the persons who are the trustees of the Advocates' Welfare Fund. The names and designation as given in the affidavit are as follow:-

Sl No	***Name***	***Designation***
i	*Mr. Maninder Singh, Ld. Additional Solicitor General of India.*	*Chairperson, Ex-officio*
ii.	*The Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Law & Justice, Government of India*	*Member, Ex-officio*

iii.	*The Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India*	*Member, Ex-officio*
iv.	*The Chairman, Bar Council of Delhi*	*Member, Ex-officio*
v.	*Ms. Nandita Rao, Additional Standing Counsel (Criminal), Delhi High Court*	*Member*
vi.	*Mr. Surya Prakash Khatri, Advocate*	*Member*
vii.	*Mr. Ved Prakash Sharma, Advocate*	*Member*
Viii	*The Secretary, Bar Council of Delhi*	*Secretary, Ex-officio*

2 Accordingly, the Chairperson and other members of the Committee are requested to appear in Court on the next date of hearing for the purpose of taking the matter forward, in particular, qua the aspect concerning framing of guidelines for disbursal of money to advocates who are in need of financial assistance.

3 The Registry will issue notice to the aforementioned persons, without Process Fee.

4 Ms. Srivastava, who is appointed as an amicus curiae in the matter, and also appears for Union of India, is requested to write to the Chairperson and members of the aforementioned Committee with regard to the developments that occurred, in Court, today.

5 Renotify the matter on 12.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~22

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11895/2015 & C.M. Appl. No.4664/2017

K.R. CHITRA

..... Petitioner

Through Petitioner in person with Ms. Chitra Srivastava, Advocate.

versus

BAR COUNCIL OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ashish Tiwari, Adv for R-1.
Mr. Santosh Kr. Tripathi, ASC with Mr. Shashank Tiwari and Mr. Perth Vishisht, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Renotify the matter with W.P. (C) No. 6705/2014 on 12.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~23

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8211/2010 & C.M. Appl. Nos.21149/2010, 22164/2010 & 484/2011

INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Aashish Gupta and Mr.Anish Gupta, Advs.

versus

RELIANCE INDUSTRIES LTD.

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Bendu Das, Adv for R-1.
Ms. Kritika Shukla, Adv for R-2.
Mr. Gaurav Mitra with Mr. S. Sharma and Mr. R.S. Prabhu, Advs for Reliance Industries.
Mr Prashant Bezboruah, Adv for R-4.
Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC with Ms. Seerat Deep Singh, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Counsel for the petitioners seeks accommodation as the main counsel is not available.

2 The request is not opposed by the counsel for the respondent.

3 Renotify the matter on 09.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~24

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7303/2013 & C.M. Appl. No. 15713/2013

M/S INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LIMITED & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Aashish Gupta and Mr.Anish Gupta, Advs.

versus

COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Bendu Das, Adv for R-1.
Mr Prashant Bezboruah, Adv for R-2.
Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC with Ms. Seerat Deep Singh, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Renotify the matter with W.P. (C) No. 8211/2010 on 09.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~26

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9182/2016

TARUN SHARMA & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Anil Kumar Gupta, Adv.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Sanjay Dewan and Ms. Palak Rohmetra, Advs. for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.37138/2016 & 43587/2016

1 Counsel for the petitioners says that as directed, an affidavit has been filed in terms of the order dated 15.03.2018.

2 To be noted, there is no appearance on behalf of the private respondents. Adverse orders are deferred.

3 Renotify the matter on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~27

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1936/2015 & C.M. Appl No.3472/2015

MERITRAC SERVICES PVT. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Nikhil Nayar, Ms. Jaspreet Sareen, Mr. Chirag Kher and Mr. Sahil Vinod, Advs.

versus

OIL AND NATURAL GAS CORPORATION LIMITED

..... Respondent

Through Mr. K.P.S. Kohli and Ms. Sharmistha Ghosh, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **02.05.2018**

1 No time left. It is already 05:00 PM.

2 Renotify the matter on 16.08.2018 in the category of 'After Notice Misc. Matters'

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~29

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4161/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.16345/2018

M/S AMBA DEVI PAPER MILLS LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Kunal Sachdeva, Adv.

versus

STATE BANK OF INDIA

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Sanjiv Kakra and Mr. Irfan Ahmed, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Counsel for the petitioner says that since an application has already been moved before the DRT, this writ petition is not pressed.

2 Accordingly, as submitted, the writ petition is disposed of as not pressed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~28

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5566/2015

M/S. PREM ICE FACTROY

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Vijay Kumar and Mr. K.S. Kashyap, Advs.

versus

DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

..... Respondent

Through None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.17681/2018

1 This application has been filed, as according to the applicant/petitioner, there is non-compliance of the directions contained in the order dated 10.10.2017. The operative directions contained in the said order required the respondent to dispose of the petitioner's appeal within a period of six weeks. Counsel for the applicant/petitioner says that needful has not been done.

2 Issue notice.

3 Renotify the matter on 30.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~46

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4656/2018 & C.M. Appl. Nos.17960-61/2018

VAIBHAV SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Heena Malik, Adv.

versus

MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. P.S. Singh and Mr. Ashwini Kumar, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Counsel for the petitioner, after some arguments, seeks leave to withdraw the petition to take recourse to an appropriate remedy for reviving the defaulting company.

2 Petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~47

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4659/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17967/2018

DINESH JOTWANI

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Harpreet Oberoi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ajay Digpaul, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Counsel for the petitioner, after some arguments, seeks leave to withdraw the petition to take recourse to an appropriate remedy for reviving the defaulting company.

2 Petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~48

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4663/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17976/2018

RAJ KUMAR ARORA AND ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Johnson Subba and Mr. Affaizi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Counsel for the petitioners, after some arguments, seeks leave to withdraw the petition to take recourse to an appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

2 Petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~41

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4649/2018

DILBAGH RAI CHAWLA AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Kumar Chitranshu, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.17948/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4649/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17947/2018

2 Issue notice.

3 Mr. Sanjay Kumar accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

4 Renotify the matter on 09.05.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~40

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4642/2018

MR. ANUJ KAPOOR AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Ritik Malik and Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Advs.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Vinod Diwakar, CGSC with Mr. Sanjay Pal, Adv for R-1 & R-2.
Ms. Amrita Prakash, CGSC for UOI/R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.17910/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4642/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17909/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr.Diwakar, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

4. To be noted the petitioners are Directors on the Boards of several companies including the defaulting company. The record shows that the defaulting company, goes by the name Vima Ice Factory Private Limited ("VIPL").

5. The Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (in short "Scheme")

has came to an end on 01.05.2018.

6. Counsel for the petitioners submits that an appeal under Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013 has been filed to seek revival of VIPL.

6.1 It is stated that the appeal is pending adjudication before the NCLT. Counsel for the petitioners submits that since the DIN & DSC of the petitioners has not been activated by the ROC, the petitioners, who are Directors on the Boards of other companies, which are active and fully functional, will get impacted adversely.

7. This aspect of the matter, to my mind, needs to be examined by the official respondents.

7.1 Mr. Diwakar, learned CGSC, seeks short accommodation to obtain instructions.

8. Accordingly, at request renotify the matter on 09.05.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~18

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9899/2017

SHREEYAM POWER AND STEEL INDUSTRIES LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Harsh Virmani, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Counsel for the petitioner seeks accommodation.

2 The request is not opposed by Mr. Jetly.

3 Renotify the matter on 19.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~19

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9900/2017

SHREEYAM POWER AND STEEL INDUSTRIES LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Harsh Virmani, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Counsel for the petitioner seeks accommodation.

2 The request is not opposed by Mr. Jetly.

3 Renotify the matter on 19.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~39

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4639/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17905/2018

NEERAJ GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Pawan Kumar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. B.S. Shukla, CGSC for UOI with Mr. Rajesh Gogha, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Issue notice.

2 Mr. Shukla, learned CGSC, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

3 Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three weeks.

4 Rejoinder thereto, if any be filed before the next date of hearing.

5 Renotify the matter on 07.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~12

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9663/2016 & C.M. Appl. No.38695/2016

M/S S S DEVELOPERS A PARTNERSHIP FIRM

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Rishabh Sancheti, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Suparna Srivastava, CGSC with Mr. Tushar Mathur, Advs

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Counsel for the respondents seeks further time to file a counter affidavit.

2 The request is acceded to.

3 Counter affidavit be filed within three weeks, failing which, the opportunity given to file counter affidavit shall stand closed.

4 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5 Renotify the matter on 19.11.2018.

6 Interim orders to continue in the meanwhile.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~25

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2767/2013

KANGARO INDUSTRIES (REGD.)

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bhuvneshwar Tyagi, Adv.

versus

KANIN (INDIA) PVT.LTD. & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Counsel for the respondents. (appearance not given.)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1 Counsel for the parties seek accommodation on account of the fact that Civil Appeal No.5007/2008 filed in the Supreme Court is pending adjudication and that its result could have impact on the instant case.

2 At request, renotify the matter on 03.12.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
A

$~36

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4621/2018

K MAHENDRA SINGH & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kamal Gupta with
Ms. Umang Tripathi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Jasmeet Singh, CGSC for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.17839/2018(Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4621/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17838/2018

2. This is a writ petition which assails the communication dated 20.04.2018, issued by the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI), Government of India, as also an earlier communication dated 19.04.2018 as has been referred to in the communication dated 20.04.2018.

3. Counsel for the petitioners states that the communication dated 19.04.2018 was not served on the petitioners.

4. Be that as it may, the net effect of the communication dated 20.04.2018 is that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) executed by the petitioners with ASI for running a cafeteria at Purana Qila and Safdurjung Tomb is not extended.

5. It is not in dispute that the petitioners were given a license to

run a Cafeteria at Purana Qila and Safdurjung Tomb. The license given to the petitioner was for a period of one year with a clause for further extension upto two years, albeit, with the mutual consent of parties which includes ASI.

6. Mr. Jasmeet Singh, learned counsel who appears on advance notice on behalf of the respondents, states that a decision has been taken not to extend the MoU beyond one year as conservation work has to be carried out at the aforementioned monuments.

7. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners had a legitimate expectation that the MoU would be extended. In support of his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners has taken me through Clause 9.02 and 9.04 of the National Policy for the Conservation of the Ancient Monuments, Archaeological Sites and Remains, 2014.

7.1 In addition thereto, the learned counsel has also relied upon the Request For Proposal dated 29.12.2016 ('RFP'). In sum, it is the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners that a policy decision was taken that all ancient monuments should have around-the-clock facilities for convenience of visitors, which included kiosk/cafeteria. It is, thus, the submission of the petitioners that closure of the cafeteria will cause inconvenience to the public apart from the fact that it would economically impact the petitioners.

8. Having regard to the submissions of the counsel, according to me, since the petitioners are licensees they do not have any legal right to continue beyond the terms of the engagement incorporated in the license. Insofar as the submission advanced on behalf of the

petitioners with regard to the legitimate expectation is concerned, it would square off against ASI's stand, which is, that the site is required for carrying out the conservation.

9. To my mind, public interest, which requires conservation of ancient monuments, would trump the legitimate expectation of the petitioners in having the license conrinued beyond the period of one year. Needless to say, the respondents will provide necessary facilities to the visitors, if not at the subject site(s), then at a location which is proximate**.**

10. The writ petition along with all pending applications is, accordingly, dismissed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/ak

$~15

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5175/2017, CM Appl.No.22093/2017

M/S. SHRI LAKSHMI COTSYNS LIMITED & ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Manisha Dhir with Mr. K.P.S.Kohli & Mr. Pranav Gambir, Advs.

versus

STATE BANK OF INDIA & ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajiv Kapur with Ms. Khushboo Kapur Advs. for SBI.
Mr. H.S.Parihar &
Mr. K.S.Parihar, Advs. for RBI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

At joint request, list on 8.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/ak

$~10

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6997/2016, CM App.No.28760/2016

MOHD. YAMEEN & ORS ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Diwan Singh Chauhan, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Barkha Babbar with
Mr. Dipanjay Tyagi, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

At joint request, list on 26.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/ak

$~38

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4634/2018

SHRI DASHARTH SINGH TANWAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ayush Choudhary with
Mr. Devanshu Yadav, Adv.

versus

DISCIPLINARY DIRECTORATE, INSTITUTE OF CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.17878/2018 (Exemption)

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4634/2018

2 The record shows that the petitioner has lodged a complaint qua respondent no.2 with the institute of Chartered Accountants of India (ICAI). The petitioner is aggrieved by the fact that neither was he called for the hearing nor does it is the impugned order dated 11.10.2017, disclose any reasons.

3 Issue notice to the respondents. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within four weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.

4 List on 22.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/ak

$~37

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4628/2018

DR B P SINHA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. D.K.Devesh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Vinod Kumar with Ms. Anju Gupta & Mr. R.L.Goel, Advs. for R-1 & 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.17852/2018 (Exemption)

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4628/2018

2 Issue notice.

3. Mr. Vinod Kumar, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent nos. 1 and 3.

4. On steps being taken by the petitioner, notice shall issue to respondent no.2. In addition, service be effected via private mode as well.

5. Counter affidavit be filed within two weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

6. To be noted, in this writ petition, the petitioner is claiming reimbursement of the balance sum of his medical claim. The sum claimed by the petitioner is Rs.2,17,208/- along with interest at the rate of 18%.

7. It is the petitioner's stand that while it is accepted by respondent no.3 that the petitioner had to be admitted to the hospital in an emergent condition, albeit, in a non-empanelled hospital, the expenses claimed have not been reimbursed only on the ground that he was required to be treated for Urinary infection and not for cancer.

8. This aspect of the matter will be examined on the next date of hearing. List the matter on 4.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
ak

$~35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4038/2018

MS SAMARAH K. MALANEY THROUGH HER MOTHER MS. NEESH KHATAU ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Aayushi Sharma, Adv.

versus

EQUESTRIAN FEDERATION OF INDIA ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Kumar Dushyant Singh with Mr. Siddharth Dutta, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

CM App.No.17922/2018

1. This is an application moved on behalf of the respondent.

2. Issue notice.

3. Ms Aayushi Sharma, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the non-applicant/petitioner. Learned counsel states that she does not wish to file a reply to the captioned application.

4. Counsels are, however, agreed that the fourth trial will be held on 14.5.2018 followed by the fifth trial which will be held on 16.5.2018.

5. I am also informed by learned counsel for the applicant/respondent that arrangements have been made for the trials to be supervised by three Judges out of which one would be a foreign Judge.

6. Accordingly, as prayed, the application is disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

7. Dasti under the signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/ak

$~33

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2670/2018

M/S DR. RANDHAWA ULTRASONOGRAPHY IMAGING AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Suhail Dutt, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Khawaja Siddiqui, Mr. Ashwini Kumar & Mr. Arup Sinha, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narula, CGSC with Mr. Abhishek Ghai, Adv. for UOI.
Ms. Hetu Arora Sethi, ASC with Mr. Abhimanyu Verma,
Dr. Girish Shastri, Distt. Nodal Officer, PS & PNDT Cell (West Distt.)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

CM No.17919/2018

1. The date fixed in the matter is 4.9.2018.

2. Since, Mr. Suhail Dutt, learned Senior Counsel states that there is urgency, list the matter on 7.8.2018.

3. Accordingly, the date already fixed i.e. 4.9.2018 shall stand cancelled.

4. In the meanwhile, the respondents will file a counter affidavit in the matter, as already directed, within three weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/ak

$~32

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11481/2017

X AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhishek Ghai, Adv. for
Mr. Sanjeev Narula, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

CM Appl No.17931/2018

1. This is an application seeking Condonation of delay. The application has been filed on behalf of the respondents. The period of delay involved is 52 days.

2. For the reasons given in the application, the delay is condoned. The Registry will formally take on record the counter affidavit.

3. The application is accordingly disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
ak

$~31

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8051/2016

UNION OF INDIA ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Amrita Prakash, CGSC

versus

SUBHASH CHNDRA AGRAWAL ..... Respondent

Through: None

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

CM App.No.17923/2018

1. This is an application moved by the petitioner for issuance of a fresh notice to the respondent. For the reasons given therein, the prayer made therein is allowed.

2. On steps being taken by the petitioner, fresh notice shall issue to the respondent. In addition, service be effected via private mode as well.

3. The application is accordingly disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/ak

$~30

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4219/2018

MS. PI AND ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through Ms. Vrinda Grover and Mr. Soutik Banerjee, Advs.

versus

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Gini J. Rautray, Standing Counsel for the JNU.
Mr. Vijay Hansaria, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Amit Anand Tiwari and Mr. Shashwat Singh, Advs for R-4.
Mr. Satyakam, ASC for R-5 & R-6 with SI Preeti.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.16548/2018 (Exemption)

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4219/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.16547/2018

2 Ms. Rautray, who appears for respondent nos. 1 to 3 has indicated to the Court that pursuant to the last hearing a two-member Fact Finding Committee has been set up by the Vice-Chancellor comprising Professor Binod Kumar Kanaujia, SC&IS and Professor Bhujang S. Waghmare, CSLG.

3. Furthermore, the learned counsel has informed the Court that respondent no.4 has resigned from all Administrative Committees and

is no longer the warden of Chandrabhaga Hostel.

4. Learned counsel further states that respondent no.4 has been advised not to use Laboratory No.409 which is attached to the School of Life Sciences (SLS). It is also the submission of Ms. Rautray that respondent no.4 will be asked to use a separate laboratory for his work at JNU.

5. Ms. Grover who appears for the petitioner has, in sum, stated that it is the bounden duty of JNU, which is classified as a Higher Education Institution, to provide a safe working environment to the petitioners i.e. the complainants.

6. Learned counsel further submits that the insistence on the part of JNU officials that the petitioners should access the Internal Complaints Committee (ICC) is not borne out from the provisions of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 (in short "2013 Act").

7. Ms. Grover states that the petitioners have no confidence in the presently constituted ICC and that they desire to pursue the criminal proceedings which stand already triggered, as noted in the previous order of the Court.

8. During the course of the arguments, Ms. Grover drew my attention to an e-mail dated 26th April, 2018 addressed to the Vice-Chancellor, wherein *inter alia*, petitioner no.1 has adverted to her face-off with respondent no.4. Ms. Grover has also referred to other e-mails, whereby, she tried to impress upon the court that despite apprehensions expressed about safety and security, no concrete action has been taken. In particular, emphasis is placed on the fact that no

restraint has been put on respondent no.4's presence on the campus. It is Ms. Grover's submission that the presence of respondent no.4 would create a "chilling effect" and, in a sense, dissuade the petitioners/complainants and potential witnesses from deposing freely before the concerned authorities.

9. In support of her submissions, Ms. Grover has also referred to the UGC Regulations which were notified on 2nd May, 2016, as also, a judgment of a Single Judge of this court in the matter of: *U.S. Verma, Principal, DPS & Anr. vs. National Commission for Women & Ors.*, 2009 SCC Online Delhi 3200.

10. Mr. Vijay Hansaria, learned senior counsel who represents respondent no.4 submits that his client has been recently served with a notice and that he would require time to respond.

10.1 It is also the submission of learned Senior counsel that additional documents had not been served on respondent no.4.

11. The broad defence taken on behalf of the respondent no.4 is that the complaints made against him are motivated and that they were triggered on account of an e-mail sent by him with regard to poor attendance of the petitioners.

12. During the course of the arguments advanced by Ms. Rautray, I had indicated to the learned counsel that since the Fact Finding Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor comprises only of male members, it may help the process of enquiry if a lady professor is also brought on board.

13. Ms. Rautray, fairly, states that she will convey the concern of the court to the Vice-Chancellor and, if necessary, take corrective

measures.

14. Since, Ms. Rautray has already indicated the various steps that the Vice-Chancellor has taken in the interest of a fair enquiry I intend to make them a part of my order to give certainty as to the manner in which the process shall move hereafter:

i) Respondent no.4 will not be part of any Administrative Committee.

ii) Respondent no.4 will not take charge as a warden of any hostel which has women inmates.

iii) Respondent no.4 will not visit or use Laboratory No.409.

iv) The Vice-Chancellor will find an alternative supervisor for petitioner no.1 and petitioner no.4. The needful will be done within the shortest possible time.

v) JNU will consider the advisability of sending respondent no. 4 on leave. This decision can be taken by JNU after the Fact Finding Committee returns its findings in the matter.

15. It is made clear that the aforementioned directions have been issued, albeit, based on the stand taken by Mr. Rautray, to provide a safe working environment to the petitioners as serious allegations have been made against respondent no.4, which are yet to be tested before an appropriate forum.

15.1 In my view, it is also in the interest of respondent no.4 to reduce the chance of interaction with the complainants or potential witnesses.

16. Respondent no.4 will file his counter affidavit within two

weeks from today.

17. Mr. Grover will ensure that the additional documents filed in the matter are served on respondent no.4 or his counsel.

18. Ms. Rautray will also ensure that by the next date of hearing, the findings of the Fact Finding Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor are placed before the Court.

19. Mr. Satyakam states that as directed by this Court, the statements made by the petitioner under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. were shown to the Vice-Chancellor.

19.1 Ms. Rautray affirms this position.

20. A status report has been filed by the Investigating Officer.

20.1 Mr. Satyakam states that a fresh status report will be filed before the next date of hearing.

21. Renotify the matter on 23.5.2018.

22. *Dasti* under the signature of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018
ak

$~7

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

\+ W.P.(C) 921/2015 & CM Appl. No.1611/2015

DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION ..... Petitioner

Through: Proxy counsel for Mr. V.K. Tandon, Adv.

versus

SURENDER PAL ..... Respondent

Through: Proxy counsel for Mr. S.K. Pathak, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1. A request for accommodation is made by learned counsel for the respondent on the ground that there is bereavement in his family. Request is not opposed.

2. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 13.11.2018.

3. In the meantime, interim order will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3064/2014

CANE AGRO ENERGY (INDIA) LTD. ..... Petitioner
Through: Ms. Neela Gokhale, Adv.

versus

THE UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondent
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner seeks and is granted further three weeks to file a rejoinder.

2. Renotify the matter on 12.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~5

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1996/2014 & CM Appl. No.4173/2014

M/S ROSE VALLEY REAL ESTATE &
CONSTRUCTIONL LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gaurav Khanna, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

At request of the counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 29.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~4

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4562/2012

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ..... Petitioner
Through: None.

versus

MUKESH AGRAWAL ..... Respondent
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of either side.

2. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 30.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3897/2018 & CM Appl. No.15385-15386/2018

NEEMA TAMANG & ORS ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Ankita Patnaik, Adv. for Ms. Garima Sachdeva, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjoy Ghose, ASC with Siwetank Singh, Advs. for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioners seeks accommodation. Request is not opposed by the counsel for respondents.

2. I am told that the connected writ petition being W.P.(C) No.1086/2018 is coming up for hearing on 27.7.2018.

3. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 27.7.2018 along with W.P.(C) No.1086/2018.

4. In the meanwhile, interim order will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~2

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2515/2018

RAVINDER KUMAR JAIN ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajni Kant with Ms. Parul Agarwal, Advs.

versus

STATE (GNCTD) AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Anya Singh, Adv. for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Ms. Anya Singh accepts notice for respondent No.1.

3. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondent No.2 & 3. Additional service be effected via private mode as well.

4. Renotify the matter on 9.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~1

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2368/2018

LALIT KUMAR GOEL, SOLE PROPRIETOR,
GOEL NCONSTRUCTION CO. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Ankur Gosain, Adv.

versus

DELHI METRO RAIL CORPORATION LTD. ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Tarun Johri, Adv. for DMRC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

CM Appl. No.9926/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.2368/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Johri accepts notice for the respondent/DMRC.

4. Mr. Gosain, who appears for the petitioner, says that he will file an additional affidavit setting out the fact that it has entered into a contract with the respondent/DMRC and that there is a possibility of disputes erupting between the parties herein.

5. Let the needful be done within 10 days from today.

6. It is to be noted that via this writ petition, the petitioner seeks to challenge the fee schedule circulated by the respondent/DMRC via impugned circular dated 26.5.2017.

7. Renotify the matter on 17.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~53

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4678/2018 & CM. APPL. No.18006-07/2018

KHIROD CHANDRA MALICK ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Satvik Bajaj, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC for R-1 to 3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to approach the NCLT for appropriate relief.

2. Writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

3. Pending applications shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~52

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4677/2018 & CM. APPL. No.18004-05/2018

DEEPIKA BUGALIA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ketan Madan with Ms. Himanshu Harbola, Advs.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mrs. Bharathi Raju, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to approach the NCLT for appropriate relief.

2. Writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

3. Pending applications shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~51

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4676/2018 & CM. APPL. No.18002-18003/2018

SAMIRA DEWAN SURI & ORS. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ketan Madan with Ms. Himanshu Harbola, Advs.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mrs. Bharathi Raju, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to approach the NCLT for appropriate relief.

2. Writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

3. Pending applications shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~50

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4667/2018

INSIYA SHEHZAD HEMANI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Giriraj Subramanium with Mr.Prateek Chadha, Mr.Vikash Pathak, Mr. Simarpal Singh Sawhney and Mr. Sidhant Krishan Singh, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Nikhil Bhardwaj, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

1. Issue notice to the respondents.

2. Mr. Arun Bhardwaj accepts notice for the respondents.

3. Counter affidavit, if any, will be filed within four weeks from today.

Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify the matter on 10.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~49

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4665/2018

POONAM GUPTA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prag Chawla, Adv.

versus

DELHI JAL BOARD ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **02.05.2018**

CM. APPL. No. 17980/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4665/2018

2. Issue notice to the respondent.

3. Counter affidavit, if any, will be filed within three weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify the matter on 22.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~43

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4652/2018

SH. RAMESH BHARDWAJ ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rohit Malik, Adv.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Hetu Arora Sethi, ASC with Mr. Abhimanyu Verma, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Yeeshu Jain with Mr. Devansh Bhatnagar, Advs. for R-2.
Mr. Sanjay Singh, Adv. for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 02.05.2018

CM. APPL. No. 17953/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4652/2018

2. Counsel for the petitioner says that he will file the title documents to demonstrate the ownership of the seller in the subject property. The person who sold the subject property to the petitioner appears to be, one, Sheela Devi.

3. Let the needful be done within two weeks from today.

4. Renotify the matter on 4.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 02, 2018/pmc

$~15

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11102/2017 & CM APP Nos.4385/2017

SHRI SHARAD YADAV

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv with Mr. Devadatt Kamat, Ms. Md. Nizam Pasha, Mr. Rajesh Inamdar, Ms. Sneha Iyer, Mr. Aditya Bhatt and Mr. Javed-ur-Rahman, Advs.

versus

SHRI RAM CHANDRA PRASAD SINGH AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Dinesh Dwivedi, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Gopal Singh, Ms. Apoorva Srivastava and Mr. B.K. Shahi, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Adv with Mr. Prasad and Ms. Zubeda Begum, Advs for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

CM APP No. 8213/2018

1 At request of counsel for the parties, renotify the matter on 23.05.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~16

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11672/2017 & CM APP No. Appl. Nos.47424-27/2017

SHRI. ALI ANWAR ANSARI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv with Mr. Devadatt Kamat, Ms. Dd. Nizam Pasha, Mr. Rajesh Inamdar, Ms. Sneha Iyer, Mr. Aditya Bhatt and Mr. Javed-ur-Rahman, Advs.

versus

SHRI RAM CHANDRA PRASAD SINGH AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Dinesh Dwivedi, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Gopal Singh, Ms. Apoorva Srivastava and Mr. B.K. Shahi, Advs. for R-1.

Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Adv with Mr. Prasad and Ms. Zubeda Begum, Advs for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1 At request of counsel for the parties, renotify the matter on 23.05.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~18

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

\+ W.P.(C) 582/2018

ZAINAB MOOJID NEAHMAH

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Liz Mathew and Ms. Purnima Krishnan, Advs.

versus

JOINT SECRETARY (FOREIGNERS) & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Mallika Hiremath for Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **03.05.2018**

1 Request for accommodation is made on behalf of Mr.Amit Mahajan on the ground that he is unwell. Request is not opposed by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

2 Renotify the matter on 09.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~40

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4499/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17301/2018

CESC LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. A.M. Singhavi, Mr. Parag P. Tripathi, Sr. Advs with Mr. Sanjeev Kapoor, Mr. Gaurav Juneja, Ms Saman Ahsani and Mr. Aditya Ganju, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Ms Monika Arora, CGSC with Mr. Kushal Kumar, Mr. Harsh Ahuja and Mr. Vibhu Tripathi, Advs for R-1 & R-2.
Mr. Kashish Narang, Adv for ICICI Bank.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1 Issue notice.

2. Ms. Monika Arora appears on advance notice for respondent No.1 & 2.

3. It is to be noted that the facts obtaining in the present case are identical to the facts obtaining in W.P.(C) No.4655/2018. Counsel for both the parties say that this writ petition can be disposed of, broadly, based on the directions passed in the aforementioned matter.

4. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:

(i) The petitioner is given liberty to approach the Tribunal within two weeks from today.

(ii) Pending adjudication by the Tribunal, the operation of the impugned communication dated 25.4.2018 shall remain stayed.

(iii) In case the decision rendered by the Tribunal is against the interest of the petitioner, the said decision will not be enforced for a period of two weeks thereafter.

(iv) It is made clear that if the petitioner does not approach the Tribunal within two weeks from today the interim protection granted will stand dissolved.

5. Pending application stand closed.

6. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~33

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4351/2018

SAEED UR REHMAN & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Rizwan and Mohd. Nadeem Khan, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC with Mr. Madhav Chitale, Adv for R-1 & R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.16860/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4351/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.16859/2018

2 Counsel for the petitioners says that an affidavit was filed. The affidavit is however not on record. Counsel would take steps.

3 Renotify the matter on 25.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~34

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4352/2018

AARTI KHANTWAL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Aseem Mehrotra, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ruchir Mishra and Mr. M.K. Tiwari, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1 Counsel for the petitioners says that an affidavit was filed. The affidavit is however not on record.

2 Renotify the matter on 30.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4353/2018

YOGESH KHANTWAL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Aseem Mehrotra, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ruchir Mishra and Mr. M.K. Tiwari, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.16865/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4353/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.16864/2018

2 Counsel for the petitioners says that an affidavit was filed. The affidavit is however not on record.

3 Renotify the matter on 30.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~37

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4687/2018

BHARAT ALUMINIUM COMPANY LTD & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. P. Chidambaram, Sr. Adv with Ms. Ranjana Roy Gawai, Ms. Vasudha Sen, Mr. Arjun Asthana and Mr. Parinay T. Vasandani, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Nitish Gupta for Mr. Ravi Prakash, CGSC for R-1 & R-2. with Mr. Kundan from the Department.
Mr. Atul Jha and Mr. Sandeep Jha, Advs for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

C.M. Appl No.18021/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4687/2018 & C.M. Appl No.18020/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Nitish Gupta accepts notice on behalf of respondent no. 1 & 2.

4. Vide this writ petition, challenge is laid to the notice dated 25.04.2018. It is not disputed by the learned counsel for the respondents that issue arising in the instant case is similar to the issue arising in the W.P. (C) No.4655/2018 titled: *Hindalco Industries*

Limited vs. Union of India and Others. Learned counsel for the respondents says that this Court may pass an order similar to the order passed in W.P. (C) 4655/2018 on 2.05.2018.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The petitioner is given liberty to approach the Tribunal within two weeks from today.

(ii) Pending adjudication by the Tribunal, the operation of the impugned communication dated 25.4.2018 shall remain stayed.

(iii) In case the decision rendered by the Tribunal is against the interest of petitioner, the said decision will not be enforced for a period of two weeks thereafter.

(iv) It is made clear that if the petitioner does not approach the Tribunal within two weeks from today, the interim protection granted, today, will stand dissolved.

6. Pending application shall stand closed.

7. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~39

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4480/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17259/2018

SUNFLAG IRON AND STEEL CO LTD

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Parag P. Tripathi, Sr. Adv with Mr. Sanjeev Kapoor, Mr. Gaurav Juneja, Ms Saman Ahsani and Mr. Aditya Ganju, Advs.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Ms Monika Arora, CGSC with Mr. Kushal Kumar, Mr. Harsh Ahuja and Mr. Vibhu Tripathi, Advs for R-1 & R-2.

Mr. Rajiv Kapur and Ms. Khushboo Kapur, Advs for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1 Issue notice.

2 Mr. Monika Arora accepts notice on behalf of the respondent no.1 & 2.

3 By virtue of this writ petition, challenge is made to the notice dated 25.04.2018. Mr. Monika Arora, who appears for the respondent no.1 & 2, says that the issue raised in the present writ petition is similar to the issue arising in the W.P. (C) No.4655/2018 titled: *Hindalco Industries Limited vs. Union of India and Others*. In these circumstances, learned

counsel for the respondents says that similar directions be issued in the captioned petition.

4 Accordingly, the writ petition and CM. No. 17259/2018 are disposed of in terms of the following directions:-

(i) The petitioner is given liberty to approach the Tribunal within two weeks from today.

(ii) Pending adjudication by the Tribunal, the operation of the impugned communication dated 25.4.2018 shall remain stayed.

(iii) In case the decision rendered by the Tribunal is against the interest of petitioner, the said decision will not be enforced for a period of two weeks thereafter.

(iv) It is made clear that if the petitioner does not approach the Tribunal within two weeks from today, the interim protection granted, today, will stand dissolved.

5 To be noted, Mr. Rajiv Kapur, who appears on behalf of the State Bank of India/respondent No.3 informs me that a communication dated 26.04.2018 was sent to the official respondents i.e., the beneficiaries, informing them that there have been no invocation of the subject bank guarantee for the reasons given therein.

6 In these circumstances, for the moment no order needs to be passed qua the subject bank guarantee. The aforementioned interim protection granted by me is confined to the contents of the notice dated 25.04.2018. In other words what is stated at the foot of the impugned notice in the form of a directive to the State Bank of India/respondent no. 3 will not be covered by the interim directions passed today

7 Petition is disposed of in the above terms.

8 Dasti under the signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~2

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

\+ W.P.(C) 674/2015 & C.M. Appl. No.1181/2015

SAI CINE PRODUCTIONS

..... Petitioner

Through Proxy counsel for the petitioner (appearance not given.)

versus

CENTRAL BOARD OF FILM CERTIFICATION AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Maninder Acharya, ASG with Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, CGSC with Mr. Harshul Choudhary, Mr. Sahil Sood, Ms. Tejaswita, Mr. Prakash, Mr. Mahesh Kumar and Mr. Viplav Acharya, Advs for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1 Request for accommodation is made on behalf of Mr. Gonsal.

2 Renotify the matter on 19.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~30

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8484/2015 & C.M. Appl. No.18230/2015

KARTAR SINGH & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through Ms. Jagriti Ahuja, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ajay Verma and Mr. Arjun Pant, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1 Learned counsel for the parties say that since the petitioners' review petition is pending in the Supreme Court, the matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify the matter on 30.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2428/2015 & C.M. Appl Nos.4371/2015 & 12669/2016

TEK CHAND NARULA & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. S.N Chaudhari and Ms. Shruti Chaudhary, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. K.K. Jha, Adv.
Mr. Santosh Kr. Tripathi, ASC with Mr. Shashank Tiwari and Mr. Parth Vasisth, Advs for GNCTD.
Mr. R.N. Vats, Standing Counsel for NDMC with Mr. Karan Kapur and Mr. Akshat Gupta, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1 Mr. Chaudhari has completed his submissions in the matter and written submissions filed by him are also on record.

2 Mr. Jha says that he is not well and, therefore, a short accommodation be given.

3 Renotify the matter on 05.07.2018.

4 Mr. Jha will file his written submissions within two weeks from today.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~4

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4946/2015 & C.M. Appl. Nos.8942/2015, 12422-31/2015

PRAKASH KEJRIWAL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Abhishek Saket, Ms. Vijaya Singh, Mr. Manish Madhukar, Ms. Shabana Farah and Mr. Rahul Dubey, Advs.

versus

LT. GOVERNOR NCT & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Santosh Kr. Tripathi, ASC with Mr. Shashank Tiwari and Mr. Parth Vasisth, Advs for GNCTD.
Mr. Tarveen Singh Nanda, Advocates for R-2 & R-3.
SI Ram Tirath and ASI Kishan Pal, from Traffic Police.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1 In this writ petition, in effect, the grievance raised by the petitioner is with regard to the central verge erected on the road running between Greater Kailash Part II from the entry point of W Block to Alaknanda.

2 Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, concedes that the National Green Tribunal (NGT), vide its order dated 01.05.2015, has, in fact, put its seal of approval on the said central verge being retained.

2.1 I am also told by the counsel for the petitioner that the very same order of the NGT has been assailed by another entity (i.e. Don Bosco School) before the Supreme Court.

3 Counsel for the petitioner, thus, seeks liberty to take recourse to an appropriate proceeding to assail the said order, given the aforementioned circumstances.

4 Writ petition is disposed of with liberty, as prayed

5 All pending applications will also stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018
A

$~20 to 23

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7984/2007 & CM APPL.15091/2007

NATIONAL MINERAL DEVLOPMENT CORPORATION

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. K. Raghavacharyulu, Mr. Kailash Pandey and Mr. Ranjeet Singh, Advocates

versus

GOVT OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through Ms. Anjana Gosain, Ms. Rabiya Singh Thakur & Ms. Shalini Nair, Advocates for UOI

Mr. Atul Jha & Mr. Sandeep Jha, Advocates for State of Chattisgarh (R-2)

Ms. Niyati Kohli, Advocate for R-3

WITH

W.P.(C) 9583/2007 & CM APPL.18004/2007

NATIONAL MINERAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. K. Raghavacharyulu, Mr. Kailash Pandey and Mr. Ranjeet Singh, Advocates

versus

GOVT. OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through Ms. Anjana Gosain, Ms. Rabiya Singh Thakur & Ms. Shalini Nair, Advocates for UOI

Mr. Atul Jha & Mr. Sandeep Jha, Advocates for State of Chattisgarh (R-2)

Ms. Niyati Kohli, Advocate for R-3

WITH

W.P.(C) 9584/2007 & CM APPL.18007/2007
NATIONAL MINERAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
..... Petitioner

Through Mr. K. Raghavacharyulu, Mr. Kailash Pandey and Mr. Ranjeet Singh, Advocates

versus

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through Ms. Anjana Gosain, Ms. Rabiya Singh Thakur & Ms. Shalini Nair, Advocates for UOI
Mr. Atul Jha & Mr. Sandeep Jha, Advocates for State of Chattisgarh (R-2)
Ms. Niyati Kohli, Advocate for R-3

AND

W.P.(C) 9585/2007 & CM APPL.18008/2007
NATIONAL MINERAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
..... Petitioner

Through Mr. K. Raghavacharyulu, Mr. Kailash Pandey and Mr. Ranjeet Singh, Advocates

versus

GOVT. OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through Ms. Anjana Gosain, Ms. Rabiya Singh Thakur & Ms. Shalini Nair, Advocates for UOI
Mr. Atul Jha & Mr. Sandeep Jha, Advocates for State of Chattisgarh

(R-2)
Ms. Niyati Kohli, Advocate for R-3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **03.05.2018**

1. At joint request of counsels for parties, renotify the matter on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~31

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6395/2016 & CM APPL.26145/2016

APEX LABORATORIES PVT. LTD. & ANR ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Abir Roy & Ms. Darpan Bhuyan, Advocates

versus

THE COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vaibhav Gaggan, Ms. Neha Mishra & Ms. Aayushi Sharma, Advocates for R-1

Mr. Amit Gupta & Mr. Anshul Saroha, Advocates for R-3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **03.05.2018**

1. At joint request of counsels for parties, renotify the matter on 19.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~32

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4187/2007 & C.M. APPL. No.7873/2007

UOI ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI

versus

MS. VEENA SIKRI ..... Respondent

Through Mr. Asif Ahmed, Advocate

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. I am informed by counsels for the parties that LPA No.347/2010 is still pending adjudication.
2. Accordingly, accommodation is sought.
3. At joint request, renotify the matter on 28.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~19

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2449/2018 & CM APPL.10186/2018

ABHAY KHANNA ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Manish Tewari & Mr. Amit A Pal, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through Mr. D. Gaurav Rohilla, Advocate for Mr. Ajay Digpaul, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of Mr. Ajay Dispaul on the ground that he is ill.
2. During the course of arguments, Mr. Rohilla, who appears on behalf of the respondents, says that there are certain additional documents which need to be filed in the matter.
3. Liberty in that behalf is granted provided the filings so made is supported by an affidavit. The copies of additional documents and the affidavit filed along with will be provided to counsel for the petitioner.
4. Renotify the matter on 05.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 237/2018 & CM APPL.13567/2018

S. B. INTERNATIONAL ..... Petitioner

Through

versus

THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF REVENUE INTELLINGENCE AND ORS.

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Aditya Singla, Sr. Standing Counsel for DRI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

CM Appl.13567/2018

1. This is an application seeking modification of the order dated 05.02.2018 passed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru.
2. Accordingly, list this matter before the same bench on 11.05.2018, subject to the orders of Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~14

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5131/2017

SONU ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Avtar Singh, Advocate

versus

THE DEPARTMENT OF EXCISE, ENTT. & LUXURY TAX & ANR

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. Counsel for petitioner seeks to withdraw the present writ petition.
2. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~13

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3885/2017 & CM APPL.17141/2017

MAHESH KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Yogesh Saini, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondent

Through Ms. Ruchi Jain, Advocate for R-1
Ms. Warisha Farasat, Advocate for R-2
SI Vishal Tiwari, PS Ambedkar Nagar

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. Ms. Warisha Farasat, who appears for respondent no.2/Delhi Police seeks time to file a counter affidavit.
2. Let the needful be done within four weeks.
3. Rejoinder thereto, if any, to the counter affidavit be filed before next date of hearing.
4. Renotify the matter on 10.09.2018.
5. Interim order will continue to operate, in the meanwhile.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~12

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

\+ W.P.(C) 974/2017

RAVISH KUMAR & ORS ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Mohd. Shshir Sarwar, Advocate for Mr. R. K. Sdini, Advocate

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondent

Through Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC for GNCTD with Ms. Mahamaya Chatterjee, Advocate

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. Once again, time is sought to file a rejoinder.
2. The request is not opposed by Mr. Narayan.
3. Accordingly, petitioners are granted three weeks to file a rejoinder in the matter.
4. Renotify the matter on 09.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~11

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

\+ W.P.(C) 575/2017 & CM APPL.2642/2017

VISHAL INTERNATIONAL ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. B. K. Singh, Mr. P. S. Bhullar & Mr. A. Kishore, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

CM Appl.2642/2017

1. Record shows that on 23.01.2017 interim order was passed by this court.
2. There is no representation on behalf of respondents.
3. Interim order dated 23.01.2017 is made absolute during the pendency of the writ petition.
4. Accordingly, CM Appl.2642/2017 is disposed of.

W.P.(C) NO.575/2017

5. Renotify the matter on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~10

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11816/2016, CM APPL.46611/2016 & CM APPL.2360/2017

MOHD MAQBOOL ..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Seema Seth, Advocate

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS ..... Respondent

Through Mr. Yeeshu Jain, Advocate for R-1
Mr. Dhanesh Relan, Standing Counsel for DDA with Ms. Gauri Chaturvedi & Ms. Mrinalini Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Prateek Dahiya, Advocate for R-2
SI Shyam Lal Dagar, PS Pal Prahladpur, South East Distt.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. Sh. Dhanesh Relan, who appears for DDA, submits that a counter affidavit was filed with the Registry on 02.05.2018 vide diary no.124247.
2. Mr. Relan will furnish a copy of the counter affidavit to learned counsel for the petitioner.
3. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.
4. Mr. Dahiya, who appears for respondent no.2, seeks and is granted three weeks time to file a counter affidavit.
5. Rejoinder, if any, to the counter affidavit filed by respondent no.2 will be filed before the next date of hearing.
6. Renotify the matter on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~9

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10484/2016, CM APPL.41128/2016 & CM APPL.653/2017

RAMESH THANWARDASS ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Pawan Kawrani, Advocate

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR ..... Respondent

Through Mr. Sanjay Dewan & Ms. Palak Rohmetra, Advocates for R-1
Mr. N. K. Singh, Advocate for Ms. Avnish Ahlawat, Advocate for R-2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1 Preliminary objection has been taken by counsel for respondent no.2.

1.1 Learned counsel says that neither the assessment order nor the order of the appellate authority has been challenged by the petitioner.

2 Faced with this situation, counsel for the petitioner says that he will take corrective action.

3 At request, renotify the matter on 22.10.2018.

CM No.41128/2016

4 In view of the aforesaid situation obtaining the captioned application, at present, is not sustainable. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~8

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10421/2016

DELHI ANUSUCHIT JATI VIKAS SANGTHAN ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Vikas Bapurao Pakmiddey, Advocate

versus

DEPARTMENT FOR THE WELFARE OF SC/ST/OBC/MINORITIES & ANR ..... Respondent

Through Mr. Mukesh Gupta, Standing Counsel for NDMC
Mr. Sumit Jidani, Advocate for GNCTD

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. Counsel for respondent no.1 is present in court. Learned counsel submits that he has been recently appointed as a panel lawyer and therefore, would require a short accommodation.
2. The request for accommodation is not opposed by counsel for the petitioner.
3. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 25.09.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~7

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8284/2016

MANAV SEWA KUSTH SAMITI AND ORS ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Harsh Singhal, Advocate for Mr. Neeraj Kr. Sharma, Advocate

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS ..... Respondent

Through Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Adv. for GNCTD
Mr. G. D. Mishra, Standing Counsel for R-4/EDMC
Mr. Ashutosh Ghade & Mr. Nikhil Goel, Advocates for DDA

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. A request is made on behalf of learned counsel for petitioner to file a rejoinder.
2. Counsel for respondents submits that a counter affidavit has already been filed.
3. Petitioners are at liberty to file a rejoinder thereto, if any, before the next date of hearing.
4. Renotify the matter on 20.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6207/2016

HARVINDER SINGH GHAI ..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Kavita, Advocate

versus

THE ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS (AIRPORT)
..... Respondent

Through Mr. Sanjeev Narula, SSC for Customs

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. Accommodation is sought on behalf of Mr. V. S. Negi, on the ground that he is not well.
2. The request is not opposed by counsel for the respondent.
3. At request, renotify the matter on 19.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~5

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9587/2015

SUDHA RANI GUPTA AND ORS ..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Anil Sharma, Mr. Arun Baali & Mr. Kunal Nath, Advocates

versus

GOVT OF NCT AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Dhananjaya Mishra, Advocate for R-1&2
Mr.V. P. Rana with Ms.Pooja Wason, Advocates for R-3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. Counsel for petitioners seeks to withdraw the present writ petition.

2. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/ab

$~28

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3020/2014 & CM APP No.6315/2014, 18076/2014

NOVARTIS INDIA LIMITED AND ANR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manoj, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL PHARMACEUTICAL PRICING AUTHORITY AND ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with Mr. Waize Ali Noor, Mr. Prateek Dhana and Mr. Saeed Qadri, Advs. for UOI.
Mr. Anjana Gosain with Ms. Rabiya Singh Thakur and Ms. Shalini Nair, Advs. for R-3 & 4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. Mr. Manoj, who appears for the petitioners, has argued in the opening.

2. Renotify the matter for further arguments on 19.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/pmc

$~27

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7983/2012 & CM APP No.19969/2012

M/S KHUSHI RAM BEHARI LAL ..... Petitioner
Through: None.

versus

M/S JASWANT SINGH BALWANT SINGH ..... Respondent
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of the parties.

2. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 28.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/pmc

$~24 & 25

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5515/2016 & CM APP No.23069/2016

GURU HARKRISHAN PUBLIC SCHOOL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Madan, Adv. for Mr. Jasmeet Singh, Adv.

versus

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION AND ANR..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Santosh Kr. Tripathi, ASC with Mr. Shashank Tiwari, Adv. for DOE.

\+ W.P.(C) 6934/2016 & CM APP No.28476/2016

GURU HARKRISHAN PUBLIC SCHOOL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Madan, Adv. for Mr. Jasmeet Singh, Adv.

versus

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDCUATION AND ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Kanishk Rana, Adv. for Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, ASC for DOE.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of Mr. Jasmeet Singh on the ground that he has taken ill. Request is not opposed by the counsel for the respondents.

2. Renotify the matter on 20.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/pmc

$~36

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4572/2018

RAGHVENDRA AGARWAL AND ORS ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek Malik with Mr. Dhawal Jain, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. T.P. Singh, Adv. for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 03.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Hindustan Biodiesel Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company").

4. To be noted, this matter came up for hearing on 01.05.2018 before this Court, where, the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit to bring on record the fact that the Company had neither carried on any business nor operated any bank account.

4.1 It is in this background that petitioner no. 2 to 4 have filed affidavits dated 02.05.2018.

4.2 The petitioners, thus, state that the Company has not carried on any business and has not operated its bank account since 2011. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Since the captioned writ petition was filed before the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 ("Scheme") was to expire, and information was sought by the Court, this writ petition can be disposed of based on directions passed in other matters. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Scheme. Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company vis-a-vis whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union of India and Ors.

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. Dasti under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 03, 2018/pmc

$~20

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11149/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~21

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11962/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~22

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11963/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~23

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

\+ W.P.(C) 12002/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~24

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

\+ W.P.(C) 12006/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~25

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

\+ W.P.(C) 12063/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~26

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

\+ W.P.(C) 12069/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P.LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~27

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

\+ W.P.(C) 12070/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~28

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

\+ W.P.(C) 12071/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~29

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

\+ W.P.(C) 12072/2005

M/S P.M.DIESELS P. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Divisht Kaushik, Adv

versus

M/S THUKRAL MECHANCIAL WORKS &

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsels for the parties submit that they are awaiting the decision of IPAB and therefore the captioned matter be stood over.

2 At request, renotify on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~31

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5656/2012

C.M.MATHEW AND ANR

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Manoj V. George, Ms. Shilpa Liza George and Mr. Francis S. Correa, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Anil Soni and Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Advocates for R-1.
Ms. Sanya Talwar, Advocate for R-2.
Mr. Rajmangal Kumar, Advocate for Mr. S.K. Dubey, Advocate for R-4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.18094/2018

1 An early hearing application has been moved on behalf of the petitioner. Counsel for the petitioner says that he was not informed that a request for adjournment would be made to the Court.

2 Having regard to the assertions made in the application, the date already fixed i.e., 16.11.2018 is cancelled.

3 Renotify the matter on 06.09.2018 at the end of 'After Notice Misc. Matters'.

4 Application disposed of in the above terms.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~32

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7728/2016

DEDICATED TO AVIATION SAFETY AND HEALTH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Vivek Kohli, Ms. Anubha Singh, Ms. Aishwarya Kaushiq with Ms. Gayatri Nandwani, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF CIVIL AVIATION (DGCA) & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Anjana Gosain, Ms. Rabiya Singh Thakur and Ms. Shalini Nair, Advocates.
Mr. Lalit Bhasin, Ms. Ratna Dwivedi Dhingra, Ms. Bhanuja Dhami and Mr. Ajay Pratap Singh, Advocates for R-4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No18192/2018

1 This is an application filed by DGCA for seeking enlargement of time. The time frame was fixed by this Court vide order dated 02.02.2018.

2 Issue notice.

3 Mr. Kohli accepts notice on behalf of the non-applicant/petitioner. Mr. Bhasin accepts notice on behalf of the non-applicant/respondent No. 2.

4 Mr. Kohli and Mr. Bhasin say that they have no objection to the

prayer made in the application.

5 Accordingly, the time frame is extended by a further period of 8 weeks subject to the DGCA/applicant's uploading the draft CAR by 15.05.2018. Needless to say that the draft CAR will be uploaded for inviting objections, if any. Pending the finalization of the fresh CAR, the existing CAR will continue to operate.

6 Application disposed of.

7 Order dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~33

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3839/2018

KARTIKEYA SHARMA AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through Ms. Mudrika Bansal, Advocate.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Gaurang Kanth, CGSC with Ms. Eshita Baruah, Advocae.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.18191/2018

1 Issue notice.

2 Ms. Eshita Baruah accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

3 By this application, the petitioners seek extension of time to comply with the directions contained in the order dated 18.04.2018.

4 The prayer made in the application is not opposed by the counsel for the official respondents.

5 Accordingly, the prayer is allowed. The petitioners will comply with the directions contained in the order dated 18.04.2018, latest by, 15.05.2018.

6 Application is disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

7 Order dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/A

$~35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4532/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17521/2018

ARUN KAPOOR ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Kanav Dev Sharma and Mr. Manu Dev Sharma, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with Ms. Anubha Bhardwaj and Mr. Kanishk Arora, Advocates for R-1 & R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. On the last date i.e. 01.05.2018, the following order was passed:-

"1. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the defaulting company i. e. Tarz Support Services Private Ltd. had on its Board two Directors i.e. the writ petitioner herein (Mr. Arun Kapoor) and another person by the name of Mr. Sachin Dev Sharma.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that after Mr. Sachin Dev Sharma took steps to avail of the benefit of the CODS-20 18 his name was removed from the impugned list of disqualified directors. It is stated that insofar as the petitioner is concerned, his name has not been excluded from the said list.

3. Mr. Kanishk who appears for the official respondents states that he will obtain instructions in the matter.

4. List on 4th May, 201 8."

2. Mr. Bhardwaj has returned with instructions. Learned counsel says that, inadvertently, the writ petitioner's name was not removed from the list of disqualified directors. It is submitted that the petitioner's name will be removed by the ROC from the list of disqualified directors within three weeks from today.

3. In these circumstances, the writ petition is disposed of based on the statement made by Mr. Bhardwaj. In the meanwhile, there shall be a stay on the operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the writ petitioner is concerned. Furthermore, the writ petitioner's DIN & DSC will also be activated.

4. *Dasti* under signatures of the court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~40

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4699/2018 & C.M. Appl. Nos.18101-02/2018

NITIN AGARWAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Prachee Satija and Ms. Radkhika Gupta, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. P.S. Singh with Ms. Anu Singh, Advocates for R-1 & 2,

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. P.S. Singh accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

3. In view of the order that I propose to pass, learned counsel for the respondents says that he does not wish to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that the defaulting company is an entity by the name Exey Technologies Private Limited (ETPL).

4.1 It is stated that ETPL at the relevant point in time had on its Board two Directors, that is, the petitioner and, one, Mr. Rajesh Choudhary.

4.2 It is further stated that Mr. Rajesh Choudhary has already moved the court by way of a writ petition, which was numbered as W.P.(C)4481/2018. I am also informed that the said writ petition came up for hearing before the Division Bench -I.

4.3 Learned counsel, in this behalf, has drawn my attention to Annexure A-1 appended to affidavit dated 03.05.2018, filed by Mr. Rajesh Choudhary, which has been placed before me, in Court, today. Annexure A-1 includes a copy of the order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) No.4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary vs. Union of India and others.*

4.4 Vide this order, the Division Bench has permitted Mr. Rajesh Choudhary to avail of the benefits of Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2013 (in short 'Scheme'). Furthermore, the Division Bench has also issued a direction to activate Mr. Rajesh Choudhary's DIN.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that Mr. Rajesh Choudhary is in the process of making the requisite filings in terms of the directions contained in the order dated 27.04.2018.

6. Given this background, the only direction that the petitioner seeks is that his DIN and DSC be re-activated.

6.1 Mr. Singh, says, having regard to the order passed by the Division Bench, he does not wish to oppose the prayer made to this court.

7. Thus, having regard to the aforementioned circumstances, the ROC is directed to activate the petitioner's DIN and DSC. This direction is issued with the caveat and the assurance of the petitioner's counsel that Mr. Rajesh Choudhary will take the steps as envisaged in the Division Bench's order, dated 27.04.2018. In case the directions contained in the said order are not complied with, the ROC will be at liberty to withdraw and/or de-activate the petitioner's

DIN and DSC.

8. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavit of Mr. Rajesh Choudhary, dated 03.05.2018, along with Annexure A-1, for the purposes of record.

9. Petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

10. Pending applications shall stand closed.

11. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~73

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4785/2018

MANOJ BHARGAVA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Sarwar Raza, Mr. Shubham Mohanti and Mr. Takrim Khan, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. A.P. Singh, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.18445/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4785/2018

2 Issue notice.

3 Mr. A.P. Singh accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

4 Counter affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks.

5 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date.

6 Renotify the matter on 01.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~42

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4701/2018

NEERAJ KUMAR SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Sarwar Raza, Mr. Shubham Mahanti and Mr. Takrim Khan, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Pratyush Miglani, Advocate for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.18105/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4701/2018

2 Issue notice.

3 Mr. Pratyush Miglani accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

4 Counter affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks.

5 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date.

6 Renotify the matter on 01.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~43

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4702/2018 & C.M. Appl Nos.18106-07/2018

VIKRAM SINGH CHAUHAN AND ANR.

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Madhavi Khare, Advocate.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. T.P. Singh, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to approach the NCLT to revive the defaulting company.

2 Writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

3 All pending applications shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~46

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4713/2018

KUMAR DHANANJAY RAKESH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Shubham Mahanti, Mr. Sarwar Raza and Mr. Takrim Khan, Advcoates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Pratyush Miglani, Advocate

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Issue notice.

2 Mr. Pratyush Miglani accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3 Counter affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks.

4 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date.

5 Renotify the matter on 05.09.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~47

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4718/2018

SABS KPO SOLUTIONS PVT LTD & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Arvind Kumar, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No. 18143/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4718/2018 & C.M. Appl. No. 18142/2018

2 Issue notice.

3 Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

4 Counter affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks.

5 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date.

6 Renotify the matter on 06.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~57

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4741/2018 & C.M. Appl. Nos.18223-24/2018

RAM NIWAS BANSAL AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Anurag Sharma, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Suparna Srivastava, CGSC with Mr. Tushar Mathur, Adv for R-1 & R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the writ petition.

2. The same is dismissed as not pressed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~60

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4751/2018

MANISH AGGARWAL AND ANR.

..... Petitioner

Through None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl No.18288/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4751/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.18287/2018

2 There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 7.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~69

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4769/2018 & C.M. Appl. No. 18420/2016

RAM DEV GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Amit Mahajan and Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Issue notice.

2 Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3 Counter affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks.

4 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date.

5 Renotify the matter on 20.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~71

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4780/2018

JYOTI KHANNA

..... Petitioner

Through None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC with Mr. Suraj Kumar, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl No.18436/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4780/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.18435/2018

2 There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 24.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~74

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4786/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.18446/2018

SURUCHI SAWHNEY

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Vivek Sibal, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Vivekanand Mishra, Sr. Penal Counsel for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Issue notice.

2 Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3 Counter affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks.

4 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date.

5 Renotify the matter on 04.09.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~38

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4680/2018

ABHISHEK GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Siddharth S. Dev, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL STOCK EXCHANGE OF INDIA LIMITED AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Sanjay Bhatt and Mr. Sumit Nagpal, Advs for R-1.
Mr. Sanyam Saxena and Mr. Sahil Khanna, Advs for R-2 with Mr. J. Srinivas, Manager.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.18013/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4680/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.18012/2018

2 Issue Notice.

3 Mr. Bhatt accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1. Mr. Sanyam Saxena accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2.

4 Notice shall issue to respondent No.3 upon the petitioner taking appropriate steps in that behalf.

5 Record shows that the petitioner has a claim against respondent No.3 which has been admitted by respondent No. 1 i.e. National Stock Exchange of India Limited. The petitioner seeks release of the money in terms of Clause 2 (h) of the SEBI circular.

6 Mr. Bhatt says that the Defaulters Committee constituted by respondent No. 1 is in the process of distributing the money, *albeit*, on a prorata basis and that he shall file a counter affidavit in that regard.

7 Accordingly, rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

8 Renotify the matter on 22.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~39

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4693/2018

SHASHANK GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Siddharth S. Dev, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL STOCK EXCHANGE OF INDIA LIMITED AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Sanjay Bhatt and Mr. Sumit Nagpal, Advs for R-1.
Mr. Sanyam Saxena and Mr. Sahil Khanna, Advs for R-2 with Mr. J. Srinivas, Manager.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.18063/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4693/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.18062/2018

2 Issue Notice.

3 Mr. Bhatt accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1. Mr. Sanyam Saxena accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2.

4 Notice be issued to respondent No.3 on petitioner taking appropriate steps.

5 The record shows that the petitioner has a claim against respondent No.3 which, concededly, has been admitted by respondent No. 1 i.e. National Stock Exchange of India Limited. The petitioner seeks the release of money in terms of Clause 2 (h) of the SEBI

circular.

6 Mr. Bhatt says that the Defaulter Committee constituted by respondent No. 1 is in the process of distributing the money on a pro rata basis and that he shall file a counter affidavit in that behalf.

7 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

8 Renotify the matter on 22.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~41

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4700/2018

MADHU GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Siddharth S. Dev, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL STOCK EXCHANGE OF INDIA LIMITED AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Sanjay Bhatt and Mr. Sumit Nagpal, Advs for R-1.
Mr. Sanyam Saxena and Mr. Sahil Khanna, Advs for R-2 with Mr. J. Srinivas, Manager.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.18104/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4700/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.18103/2018

2 Issue Notice.

3 Mr. Bhatt accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1. Mr. Sanyam Saxena accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2.

4 Notice shall issue to respondent No.3 upon the petitioner taking appropriate steps in that behalf.

5 Record shows that the petitioner has a claim against respondent No.3 which has been admitted by respondent No. 1 i.e. National Stock Exchange of India Limited. The petitioner seeks release of the money in terms of Clause 2 (h) of the SEBI circular.

6 Mr. Bhatt says that the Defaulters Committee constituted by respondent No. 1 is in the process of distributing the money, *albeit*, on a prorata basis and that he shall file a counter affidavit in that regard.

7 Accordingly, rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

8 Renotify the matter on 22.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~48

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4729/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.18164-65/2018

FLINSTONETECHNOLOGIES PVT. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Salman Kurshid, Sr. Adv with Mr. Sameer Kumar, Mr. Prateek Singh Chaudhary, Mr. Aman Khullar and Ms. Kanika, Advs.

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. H.S. Parihar and Mr. K.S. Parihar, Advs for R-1.
Mr. Gaurang Kanth, CGSC with Ms. Eshita Baruah, Adv for R-2.
Mr. Amit Bansal and Mr. Akhil Kulshreshtha, Advs for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1 Learned counsel for the parties informs me that the issue which arises in the captioned writ petition is similar to the issue which arises in the writ petition No. 3677/2018, titled: *Kali Digital Ecosystems Pvt. Ltd. vs. Reserve Bank of India & Others*. I am informed that the said writ petition is being heard by the Division Bench.

2 Accordingly, at request of the counsel for the parties, list the captioned writ petition before the Division Bench before whom W.P.(C) No.3677/2018 is placed for hearing on 24.05.2018 subject to orders of the Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/A

$~44

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4703/2018

YOGESH BHATIA ..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Gurmeet Bindra, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent

Through Mr. Rakesh Kumar, CGSC with Mr. Santosh Kumar Pandey, Govt. Pleader

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.18109/2018

1 Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4703/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.18108/2018

2 Mr. Rakesh Kumar, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

3 The substantive prayer made in the petition is as follow:-

"Issue a Writ of Mandamus, or any other appropriate Writ/Order or Direction to the Respondent to either allow the Petitioner to submit his application for issuance of the passport without parentage or accept his birth certificate as the document with respect to the parentage and the matriculation certificate purely for the purpose showing educational qualification for issuance of Passport under the Non-ECR category;"

4 In view of the order, that I propose to pass, learned counsel for the respondent says that he does not wish to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

5 Record shows that it is the assertion of the petitioner that his biological parents are, one, Mr. Shiv Kumar Bhatia and Ms. Sunita Bhatia. It appears that due peculiar circumstances at home the names of petitioner's deceased uncle and aunt ,that is, late Mr. Amrish Kumar Bhatia and Ms. Ritu Kumar Bhatia were entered in his school record.

5.1 Consequently, in the class X certificate issued by CBSE, against parents' names, the names of 'Mr. A. K Bhatia' and 'Ms. Ritu Bhatia' were recorded.

6 Being aggrieved the petitioner has approached this Court for the following reliefs:

(i) that his application for issuance of passport be accepted without insistence on the names of his parents being inserted.

(ii) or, in the alternative, his application be accepted based on his birth certificate.

7. Mr. Rakesh Kumar, CGSC who appears for the respondent says that since no application for issuance of passport has been preferred, the petition, in a sense, is premature.

8. Clearly, the only reason that the petitioner has approached the Court is that he cannot knowingly fill up incorrect details with respect to parents name in the application for issuance of passport.

9. Given the peculiar circumstances that the petitioner is placed in, he is given liberty to file the application for issuance of passport disclosing the names of his biological parents. Along with the application, the petitioner will append a representation, wherein, the aforementioned facts with regard to his parentage would be mentioned. The representation filed by the petitioner will be accompanied by the relevant documents including his birth certificate.

10. In case such an application along with a representation, as indicated above, is filed by the petitioner the respondent will deliberate upon the same and pass a speaking order within six weeks of the same being lodged. A copy of the speaking order will be furnished to the petitioner. The petitioner will have liberty to assail the same, if aggrieved, albeit, in accordance with law.

11. Petition disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~36

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4581/2018

JAGDISH VISHNOI AND ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Varun Kashyap and Mr. Saurabh Jain, Advs.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Dev. P. Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI/R-1 & R-2. With Ms. Anubha Bhardwaj and Mr. Kanishk Arora, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Fortune Nidhi Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company").

4. To be noted, this matter came up for hearing on 01.05.2018 before this Court, where, the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit to bring on record as to the period for which the defaulting company has not carried out any business and operated any bank account.

4.1 It is in this background that petitioner no. 1 to 3 have filed affidavits dated 03.05.2018.

4.2 The petitioners, thus, state that the Company has not carried on any business and has not operated its bank account since incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Since the captioned writ petition was filed before the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 ("Scheme") was to expire, and information was sought by the Court, this writ petition can be disposed of based on directions passed in other matters. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Scheme. Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: *Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.*

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P.(C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union of India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, which results in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
A

$~37

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4594/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.17755-56/2018

SUNIL KUMAR GUPTA & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through Ms. Anju B. Gupta, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. T.P. Singh, Adv. for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Disha Electrotech Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company").

4. To be noted, this matter came up for hearing on 01.05.2018 before this Court, where, the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit to bring on record the fact as to whether the person who is a Director on the Board of the subject company but is not a petitioner before this Court would have any objection to the relief sought qua the subject company.

4.1 It is in this background that petitioner no. 1 & 2 have filed affidavits dated 03.05.2018 along with a copy of scanned unattested affidavit of Mr. Ajay Kumar Sharma along with his email dated 03.05.2018.

4.2 The petitioners, thus, state that the Company has not carried on any business since the last four years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Since the captioned writ petition was filed before the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 ("Scheme") was to expire, and information was sought by the Court, this writ petition can be disposed of based on directions passed in other matters. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Scheme. Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies in consonance with Division Bench-I order dated 27.04.2018, passed in W.P. (C) 4481/2018, titled: Rajesh Choudhary v. Union Of India and Anr.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company vis-a-vis whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union of India and Ors.

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, which results in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

13. Dasti under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/A

$~19

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

\+ W.P.(C) 14541/2004

RANBAXY LABORATORIES LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. K. Datta and Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocates.

versus

UOI & ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC and Mr. Kanishk Arora, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

CM No.18394/2018 (application for substitution)

1. Issue notice.

1.1 Mr. Bhardwaj accepts notice of behalf of the respondents.

1.2 Mr. Bhardwaj says in view of the prayer made in the application, he does not wish to file a reply.

2. For the reasons given in the application, the prayer is allowed.

3. The amended memo of parties filed with the application is taken on record.

CM No.18396/2018

4. Issue notice.

4.1 Mr. Bhardwaj accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. Mr. Bhardwaj seeks and is granted two (2) weeks to file a reply

to the application.

6. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

7. Renotify the matter on 12.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
cks

$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8963/2015

SUNDER LAL SINGHAL & ORS ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. S.K. Verma, Mr. R.K. Pandey, Ms. Megha Gurang and Ms. Sujata, Advocates with petitioner in person.

versus

GAON SABHA MOLARBAND ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

At request, renotify the matter on 23.10.2018.

In the meanwhile, the interim order will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
hs

$~7

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

\+ W.P.(C) 12100/2016

AMANATULLA KHAN ESQ ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bahar U. Baroi, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC with Mr. Aditya Goyal, Advocates for R-1, 2 and R-4.
Mr. Satyakam, ASC/GNCTD with Mr. Shashwat, Advocate.
Mr. Rakesh Kumar, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner says that he does not wish to file a rejoinder in the matter. The said statement is taken on record.

2. Renotify the matter on 17.09.2018.

3. In the meanwhile, the parties will file written submissions, not exceeding 3 pages.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
hs

$~8

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1619/2017

CENTRAL PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER
UPSC ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate.

versus

AJIT KUMAR ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

There is no representation on behalf of respondent.

Issue court notice to the respondent.

Renotify the matter on 26.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
hs

$~9

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2670/2017

A S RAWAT ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Jyoti Dutt Sharma and Mr. C.K. Bhatt, Advocates.

versus

DAWA TASHI ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of respondent.

2. Renotify the matter on 27.11.2018.

3. Interim order will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
hs

$~10

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3556/2017

MONSANTO HOLDINGS PRIVATE LIMITED
& ORS ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Bitika Sharma, Ms. Deepshikha Malhotra, Mr. Lakshay Kaushik and Ms. Mansee, Advocates.

versus

COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA
& ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Advocate alongwith Mr. Pallav Saxena, Bindu Das & Mr. Ashutosh Shandilya, Advocates for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. The record of the registry shows that service qua respondent no.6 and 8 has not been effected as yet.

2. Respondent No. 2 who is present in Court says he has filed his counter affidavit in the matter. Copies of the same are given to the counsel for the petitioner. Rejoinder, if any, be filed before the next date.

3. Renotify the matter on 8.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
hs

$~15

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1776/2016

MONASNTO HOLDINGS PVT LTD AND ORS ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Bitika Sharma, Ms. Deepshikha Malhotra and Mr. Lakshay Kaushik, Advocates.

versus

COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil J. Mathews, Advocate for UOI.
Mr. Vaibhav Chookse, Advocate for R-3 to 5.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 8.10.2018 along with W.P.(C) No.3556/2017.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
hs

$~16

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1777/2016

MAHARASHTRA HYBRID SEEDS COMPANY PRIVATE LIMITED ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abdullah Hussain, Ms. Kanika Chaudhary Nayar, Mr. Arjun Nihal Singh and Ms. Gayatri Ragunandan, Advocates.

versus

THE COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Joy Basu, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Amit Tyagi and Mr. Abhinav, Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Sunil J. Mathews with Ms. Ruchi Jain, Advocates for UOI.
Mr. Vaibhav Chookse, Advocate for R-3 to 5.
Ms. Bitika Sharma, Ms. Deepshikha Malhotra and Mr. Lakshay Kaushik, Advocates for R-5 to 7.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 8.10.2018 along with W.P.(C) No.1776/2016.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
hs

$~34

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4515/2018

SWAROOP ROUND THE CLOCK CONVENIENCE STORE ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anuj Dhir, Advocate.

versus

OFFICE OF THE ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER OF POLICE & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjoy Ghose, ASC/GNCTD with Mr. Shwetank Singh and Ms. Urvi Mohan, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Ghose, who appears on behalf of respondent.

2. Mr. Ghose says that even if the petitioner runs a convenience store, the petitioner would require a license from the concerned municipal corporation. He says that petitioner wishes to run a 24 hour convenience store.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner on the other hand says that no license is required from the municipal corporation.

4. In order to cut short the controversy North Delhi Municipal Corporation (NDMC) is arrayed as party to the present petition. The NDMC will now stand impleaded as respondent No.4.

5. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondent no.4. In addition, service be made effective via private mode as well. Liberty is also given to serve the standing counsel. A copy of the order will accompany the notice. Counsel for NDMC will obtain instructions on the issue articulated above.

6. Renotify the matter on 16.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
cks

$~30

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3098/2014

SOCIETY FOR REVOLUTION AGAINST CORRUPTION

THROUGH: ITS GEN. SECRETARY ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Saroj Bidawal, Advocate for UOI.
Mr. Ayush Negi, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. I am informed that the respondent no.2 has already filed its counter affidavit.

4. Liberty is given to the petitioner to file its rejoinder before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify the matter on 22.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
cks

$~18

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9358/2014

INDRA PARK INDIRA MARKET WERLARE ASSOCIATION (REGD.) ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. S.K. Rungta, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Prashant Singh, Mr. Shivankur Shukla and Mr. Varun Gupta, Advocates.
Mr. Dinesh Dogra and Mr. Bhaskar Upadhaya, Advocates for petitioner no.2 (proposed).

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

C.M Nos.2611/2018 & 2469/2018

1. Mr. S.K. Rungta, who appears for the non-applicant/petitioner seeks and is granted three (3) weeks to file a reply.

3. Renotify the matter on 22.10.2018.

W.P.(C) 9358/2014

4. I am informed that pleadings are complete.

5. Interim order will continue to operate, in the meanwhile.

6. Renotify the matter on 22.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/cks

$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3716/2014

S.R. WADHWA & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Dipti Mittal, Proxy Counsel for P-1.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Prateek Dahiya, Advocate for R-1 & 4.
Mr. A.K. Gautam, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for respondent no.1 to 4 says that the issue which arises in this writ petition is covered by the judgment dated 22.03.2017, passed in W.P.(C) No.699/2014. The said judgment has been passed by a Division Bench of this Court.

2. Copy of the status report and the judgment are handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

2.1 Learned counsel says that he will examine the same and revert with instructions.

3. At request, renotify the matter on 8.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
cks

$~13

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7575/2017

NSC PROJECTS (P) LTD ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajat Tandon, Advocate.

versus

MILITARY ENGINEERING SERVICE AND ANR ... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. T.P. Singh, Adv for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. Counsel for the respondent informs me that a date has been fixed by the concerned authority to hear the petitioner's representative.

2. I am informed the hearing is fixed on 14.05.2018.

3. Counsel for the respondent is not able to inform me about the time when the hearing is to be held.

4. Accordingly, the concerned authority is directed to conduct its hearing at 2.30 PM.

5. Renotify the matter on 14.05.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
cks

$~12

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5120/2017

M/S SHUSHILA HOSPITAL
THROUGH: ITS PROPRIETOR AJIT SINGH ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Kshitij Kumar, Advocate.

versus

THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE / DC (NORTH), DISTRICT APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Sachin, Advocate for R-1 and 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. Mr. Sachin seeks and is granted four (4) weeks to file a counter affidavit. Rejoinder, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

2. Renotify the matter on 16.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
cks

$~5

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6639/2015 & CM. APPL. No.12111/2015

BANWARI LAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jasbir Singh Malik, Adv.

versus

DELHI FINANCIAL CORPORATION & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajan Tyagi, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Keshav Mohan with Mr. Kabir Ghosh, Advs. for R-2 & 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. I am told by counsel for the petitioner that he will take steps to effect service on respondent No.2 & 4. Liberty in this behalf is granted.

2. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondent No.2 & 4. Additionally, counsel for the petitioner is given liberty to serve respondent No.2 & 4 via private mode as well.

3. Insofar as respondent No.3 is concerned, learned counsel for respondent No.1 says that the said respondent has expired.

4. Counsel for the petitioner will take steps to bring legal heirs of respondent No.3 on record in accordance with law.

5. Renotify the matter on 15.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/pmc

$~2

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7653/2014

RAM MANORATH SHUKLA & ORS. ..... Petitioner
Through: None.

versus

SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF LABOUR & ORS..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Harsh Pandit, Adv. for Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

2. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 13.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/pmc

$~1

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8321/2017 & CM. APPL. No.34200/2017

KRIPA SHANKAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Tripta Kanojia, Adv.

versus

LD CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION AND ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Dinesh C. Pandey with Mr. Rajeev Gurung, Advs. for R-4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. Ms. Kanojia, who appears for the petitioner, seeks and is granted three weeks from today to file a rejoinder.

2. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 9.10.2018.

3. In the meanwhile, interim order will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/pmc

$~66

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4374/2018 & CM. APPL. No.16982-83/2018

ACTION COMMITTEE UNAIDED
RECOGNIZED PRIVATE SCHOOLS ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sunil Gupta, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Kamal Gupta, Mrs. Tripti Gupta and Ms. Ayushi Dhingra, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ramesh Singh, Standing Counsel with Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC with Ms. Mahamaya Chatterjee, Mr. Abhinav Goyal and Mr. Chirayu Jain, Advs. for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **04.05.2018**

List before another Bench on 8.5.2018, subject to the orders of Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/pmc

$~67, 68 & 70

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4766/2018

BLS IT SERVICES PVT. LTD.
(THROUGH: ITS DIRECTOR) ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Arvind Sharma, Mr. Mukund Kumar and Mr. Anant Kanojia, Advs.

versus

TOPSGRUP SERVICES LTD.
(THROUGH: ITS DIRECTOR) AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. P.S. Sridhar Raj, Adv. for R-1.

\+ W.P.(C) 4767/2018

BLS E-SERVICES PVT. LTD
THROUGH: ITD DIRECTOR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Arvind Sharma, Mr. Mukund Kumar and Mr. Anant Kanojia, Advs.

versus

TOPSGRUP SERVICES LTD.
THROUGH: ITS DIRECTOR AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. P.S. Sridhar Raj, Adv. for R-1.

\+ W.P.(C) 4775/2018

BLS E-SOLUTIONS PVT. LTD.
(THROUGH: ITS DIRECTOR) ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Arvind Sharma, Mr. Mukund Kumar and Mr. Anant Kanojia, Advs.

versus

TOPSGRUP SERVICES LTD.
THROUGH: ITS DIRECTOR AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. P.S. Sridhar Raj, Adv. for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

CM. APPL. No.18415/2018 in W.P.(C) No.4766/2018
CM. APPL. No.18417/2018 in W.P.(C) No.4767/2018
CM. APPL. No.18427/2018 in W.P.(C) No.4775/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4766/2018 & CM. APPL. No.18414/2018
W.P.(C) No.4767/2018 & CM. APPL. No.18416/2018
W.P.(C) No.4775/2018 & CM. APPL. No.18426/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. P.S. Sridhar Raj accepts notice for the first respondent. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to the second respondent.

4. Mr. Sibal, learned Senior Counsel, who appears for the petitioners in the captioned writ petitions, says that the first respondent had triggered proceedings under Section 9 of Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 before the National Company Law Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as "NCLT"). It is Mr. Sibal's contention that the first respondent had claimed an aggregate sum of Rs.3,77,01,461/-. He further submits that the petitioners and the first respondent have arrived at a settlement, which was executed between them on 2.5.2018. Mr. Sibal also submits that in pursuance of the settlement agreement arrived at between the parties, a sum of Rs.4 Crores inclusive of interest has been paid to the first respondent.

4.1 Counsel for the first respondent affirms the above position.

5. Mr. Sibal contends that the reason the petitioners have approached this Court by way of the writ petitions under Article 226 is that

even though a settlement has been arrived at between the parties, the Interim Resolution Professional (IRP) is likely to take steps in the matter pursuant to the directions issued by NCLT vide the impugned order dated 26.4.2018.

6. Learned Senior Counsel further submits that any steps taken by IRP will cause detriment to the petitioners especially in the circumstances and that as of now no grievance remains outstanding *vis-a-vis* the first respondent. Learned counsel says that since the petitioners intend to bring up their petitions for hearing before the Supreme Court shortly, they would require protection from this Court and hence the reason for moving the captioned petitions.

7. Counsel for the first respondent says that he has no objection to the plea for interim protection made on behalf of the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, it is directed that till the next date of hearing, no further steps will be taken by the IRP pursuant to the impugned order dated 26.4.2018, passed by NCLT.

9. Renotify the matter on 8.10.2018.

10. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/pmc

$~65

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

\+ W.P.(C) 600/2017

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arun Bhardwaj with Mr. Nikhil Bhardwaj, Advs.

versus

NEERAJ & ANR ..... Respondent

Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

CM. APPL. No.18395/2018

1. Issue notice to the non-applicants/respondents. In addition service be effected via counsel as well.

2. Reply, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. Renotify the matter on 22.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/pmc

$~64

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7979/2010

JASLEEN RAVI INDER SINGH & ORS ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Lalit Gupta, Adv.

versus

LAND AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Saeed Qadri, Adv. for Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC for UOI.
Mr. Ajay Verma, Adv. for DDA.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

CM APP No.18388/2018

In terms of order dated 16.3.2018, list the captioned application on 10.5.2018 before HMJ Vibhu Bakhru, subject to the orders of Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/pmc

$~11

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4795/2017 & CM APP No.20766/2017

BHUSHAN POWER & STEEL LTD. ..... Petitioner
Through: Ms. Niyati Kohli, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondent
Through: Ms. Mallika Hiremath, Adv. for Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

At joint request, renotify the matter on 13.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/pmc

$~14

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8054/2017

RITU MALIK ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bharat Gupta with Mr. Vishesh Chauhan and Ms. Shreya Rao, Advs.

versus

LAND & DEVELOPMENT OFFICE ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Anil Dabas, Adv. for R-1/L&DO.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

At joint request, renotify the matter on 12.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/pmc

$~3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9143/2014 & CM APP No.47382/2016

MATHEW THOMAS ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Prasanna S., Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Lalit Bhasin, Ms. Ratna Dwivedi Dhingraia, Ms. Bhawna Dhami and Mr. Ajay Pratap Singh, Advs. for R-2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. Mr. Bhasin, who, appears on behalf of respondent no.2 seeks accommodation. The request is not opposed either by counsel for the petitioner or by counsel for respondent no.1.

2. Accordingly, at request, renotify the matter on 19.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~4

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

\+ W.P.(C) 250/2015

VED PRAKASH GUPTA ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Saurabh Suman Sinha, Adv.

versus

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA & ANR. ..... Respondents
Through : Ms. Gunjan Singh, Adv. for R-1.
Ms. Jagriti Ahuja, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **04.05.2018**

1. Counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the captioned writ petition. Learned counsels for the respondents say that they have no objection to the same.

2. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~62

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4758/2018 & CM APP Nos.18319-20/2018

SMT. D. LAKSHMI ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Pushkar Sood, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with
Mr. Vinod Tiwari, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

CM APP Nos.18319-20/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4758/2018

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the fact that the respondents are not executing a lease/conveyance deed, in respect of the Verandah abutting the shop of the petitioner, situate in Mohan Singh Market (INA), New Delhi, at the rates as applicable in 2011.

3. Issue notice to the respondents. Mr. Rajesh Gogna accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3.1 Counter affidavit be filed within four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify the matter on 30.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018/mk

$~61

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4755/2018 & CM No.18299/2018

INSPIRA ENTERPRISES INDIA (P) LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Anup Bhambani, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Rahul Narayan and Mr. Shashwat Goel, Advs.

versus

POWER GRID CORPORATION OF INDIA LIMITED AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through : Mr. S.B. Upadhyay, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Sharmila Upadhyay, Mr. Rajesh Chhetri, Mr. Sarabjeet Pratap Singh and Mr. Nishant Kumar, Advs. for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. Issue notice to the respondents. Ms. Sharmila Upadhyay accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.1.

2. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondent no.2.

3. Mr. Upadhyay says that in the meanwhile, respondent no.1 will carry out further inquiry in terms of the order dated 22.1.2018 passed by the Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No.1308/2018.

3.1 To be noted, the said writ petition was followed by another writ petition, which is numbered as CWP No.3095/2018.

3.2 To be noted in the meanwhile respondent no.1 had issued the communication dated 19.1.2018.

3.3 The second writ petition, though, had to be withdrawn in view of the objection taken on behalf of the respondent no.1 with regard to territorial jurisdiction of Punjab and Haryana High Court.

4. Notwithstanding the above, directions issued in the order dated 22.1.2018 need to be implemented as all that respondent no.1 has been asked to do is to carry out an inquiry.

5. As indicated above, Mr. Upadhyay has already stated that an inquiry will be carried out in terms of the order dated 22.1.2018.

6. In the meanwhile, the interim directions as contained in order dated 19.4.2018, passed in CWP No.3095/2018, passed by Punjab and Haryana High Court will continue to operate as if they had been passed in the captioned writ petition.

7. Furthermore, counter affidavit(s) be filed within three weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

8. Renotify the matter on 29.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~58

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4746/2018 & CM APP Nos.18264-65/2018

MOHIT SHARMA ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Nukul Pathania, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent
Through : Mr. Sanjeev Narula, CGSC with Mr. Vinod Tiwari and Ms. Anumita Chandra, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **04.05.2018**

CM APP Nos.18264-65/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4746/2018

2. Issue notice to the respondent. Mr. Sanjeev Narula accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Counter affidavit be filed within four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. Renotify the matter on 6.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~56

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4740/2018

ANJU DEVI ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Anil Singal, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr. Abhinav Tyagi and Mr. Brijesh Kumar, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Jawahar Raja, ASC, GNCTD with Mr. Chinmay Kanojia, Adv. for R-2 to 5 along with Mr. Bijender Kumar, ASI, Rohini Distt.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. The petitioner, who is the wife of, one, Mr. Jagvir Singh claims compensation for the sum of Rs.1 crore from the respondents.

2. To be noted, the petitioner's husband died in the line of duty.

3. Death of the petitioner's husband took place on 12th/13th October, 2014. It is the petitioner's case that Lieutenant Governor/respondent no.2 had announced that compensation in the sum of Rs.1 crore, would be paid to the kith and kin of late Mr. Jagvir Singh.

4. Issue notice to the respondents. Mr. Jawahar Raja accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.2 to 5. Likewise, Mr. Anil Soni accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.1.

5. Counter affidavit(s) be filed within four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

6. Renotify the matter on 20.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~55

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4739/2018

RAM KHUSH SINGH ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Ashwani Tripathi, Adv.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Sachin Nahar, Adv. for R-1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

1. The limited grievance of the petitioner is that respondent no.1 and 2 are not taking up his application for hearing filed under Section 23 of the Maintenance and Welfare of the Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007. It is stated that the said application was filed on 24.10.2017 vide diary no.5672.

2. Issue notice to the respondents. Mr. Sachin Nahar, who accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.1 and 2, says that he will obtain instructions.

3. On steps being taken, notice shall also issue to respondent no.3 and 4. Additional service be effected by private mode as well.

4. Renotify the matter on 4.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~54

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

CM APP No.18242/2018 in
\+ W.P.(C) 2725/2018

MRS. ROSELINE WILSON AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through : None.

versus

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA
AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with
Ms. Liu Gangmei, Adv. for R-1 to 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **04.05.2018**

CM APP No.18242/2018

1. This is an application for condonation of delay. This application has been moved by respondent no.1/ASI. The period of delay involved is 18 days.

2. For the reasons given therein, the delay is condoned. The application is disposed of. The Registry will now, formally, take on record the counter affidavit filed on behalf of respondent no.1/ASI.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~52

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

CM APP No.18272/2018 in
\+ W.P.(C) 2829/2017

SHRI LAL MAHAL LTD ..... Petitioner

Through : Ms. Anjali J. Manish, Mr. Priyadarshi Manish, Mr. Prem Kandpal, Mr. Prateek Chaturvedi and Ms Nidhi Saini, Advs.

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Amit Kasera, Ms. Geetika Matta and Mr. Elakkumaran, Advs. for R-1/RBI.
Mr. Rajiv Kapur and Ms. Khushboo Kapur, Advs. for R-3 to 5.
Mr. Aditya Singla, Sr. St. Counsel for R-9/DRI.
Mr. Sanjeev Bhatt and Mr. Sumit Nagpal, Advs. for R-12/IDBI Bank Limited.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

CM APP No.18272/2018

1. This is an application moved on behalf of respondent no.3 to 5 for vacating the order dated 22.3.2018 passed by this court.

1.2 Accommodation is sought on behalf of Mr. C. Mukund, learned counsel for respondent no.1/RBI.

2. The main matter is listed for hearing on 25.7.2018. List this application on the same date i.e., 25.7.2018

3. In the meanwhile, learned counsel for the applicant will serve a copy of the application on counsel for the parties.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~51

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4734/2018 & CM APP Nos.18193-94/2018

GOPALGIRI KRISHNAGIRI GOSWAMI AND ANR.... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Virendra Rawat and
Mr. Kamal Kapoor, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC
with Mr. T.P. Singh, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **04.05.2018**

CM APP No.18194/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4734/2018 & CM APP No.18193/2018

2. Issue notice to the respondents. Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Counter affidavit be filed within four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. Renotify the matter on 4.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~50

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4732/2018 & CM APP No.18170/2018

NAVEEN KUMAR KANODIA ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Pramod Gupta, Ms. Mannat and Ms. Khushboo Aggarwal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. .... Respondents
Through : Mr. Ashim Sood, CGSC with Mr. Rhythm Buaria, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **04.05.2018**

CM APP No.18170/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4732/2018

2. Issue notice to the respondents. Mr. Ashim Sood accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Counter affidavit be filed within four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. Renotify the matter on 9.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~49

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4731/2018 & CM APP Nos.18168-69/2018

OKHLA INDUSTRIAL ESTATE ASSOCIATION (REGD.) ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Gaurav Puri, Adv.

versus

DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED (DSIIDC) AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through : Ms. Deepali Gupta, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC for GNCTD with Mr. Abhinav Goyal and Ms. Mahamaya Chatterjee, Adv. for R-2&3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 04.05.2018

CM APP No.18169/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4731/2018 & CM APP No.18168/2018

2. Mr. Narayan, who appears for respondent no.2 and 3 raise a preliminary objection that individual shed/plot holders have not come forward to articulate their grievances. Mr. Narayan says that affidavit accompanying the petition does not disclose the authority of the person who has filed the petition.

2.1 Mr. Suri says that he will take requisite measures and therefore, the matter be stood over.

3. At request, renotify the matter on 28.5.2018.

4. In the meanwhile, subject to the aforesaid preliminary objection taken by Mr. Narayan, respondents will be at liberty to file their counter affidavit(s). The needful will be done before the next date of hearing.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 04, 2018
mk

$~1

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

\+ W.P.(C) 463/2018 & C.M. Appl. Nos.2006/2018, 11943/2018, 16244-45/2018 & 16371/2018

M/S BGR MINING AND INFRA LIMITED ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Mohd. Wasaly Khan, Advocate.

versus

NTPC LIMITED AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Tushar Mehta, ASG with Mr. Puneet Taneja, Ms. Shaheen and Mr. Kanu Agrawal Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 05.05.2018

1. List along with W.P.(C) 702/2018 on 17.05.2018 at 2:30 p.m.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 05, 2018
p

$~2

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

\+ W.P.(C) 702/2018 & C.M. Appl. Nos.3014/2018, 3015/2018, 11940/2018

NCC-BGR CONSORTINUM AND ANR. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ramji Srinivasan, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Priya Kumar, Mr. Adhish Srivastava, Mr. Tushar Bhardwaj, Mr. Sujit Singh and Mr. Anand Chichra Advocates.

versus

NTPC LTD. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Tushar Mehta, ASG with Mr. Puneet Taneja, Ms. Shaheen and Mr. Kanu Agrawal Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 05.05.2018

1. Mr. Ramji Srinivasan, learned Senior counsel, has argued on behalf of the petitioners.

2. List for reply of Mr. Tushar Mehta, learned ASG, on 17.05.2018 at 2:30 p.m.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 05, 2018
p

$~3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5960/2012

PAWAN ANAND & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through None.

versus

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF HEALTH SERVICES & OTHERS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Jasmeet Singh and Mr. Srivats Kaushal, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 05.05.2018

1 Request for accommodation is made on behalf of the Director General of Health Services. It is stated that there was communication gap and hence the officials were not informed of the fact that the matter was listed today.

2 Accordingly, renotify the matter on 06.09.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 05, 2018
A

$~9

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8648/2016 & CM APPL. 35612/2016,
CM APPL. 18712/2018, CM APPL. 18771/2018
ANITA DEVI - I ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravi Sikri, Senior Advocate along with Mr. Deepank Yadav and Mr. G.S. Mani, Advocates

versus

INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Mala Narayan, Ms. Neha Dawar and Ms. Madhumati Ghosh, Advocates for R-1 to R-4
Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Kavindra Gill, Advocate for R-5
Mr. Atul Bandhu, Advocate for R-6
Mr. Rizwan, Advocate for R-8 and R-12
Ms. Isha Mital and Mr. Apoorv Kurup, Advocate for R-17
Mr. Vivek Aggarwal, Standing Counsel for NDMC and Mr. Abhishek Mishra, ASC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Counter affidavit is filed on behalf of respondent no. 1 to 4.

2. Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, counsel for respondent No.5 says that he does not wish to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

3. It appears that counter affidavits have not been filed on behalf of respondent no. 6 to 18.

4. Mr. Mr. Atul Bandhu, who, appears for respondent no. 6 says that he would require five weeks to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

5. At this stage counsel for respondent no. 10 says that counter affidavit has been filed but the same is not on record. Counsel will take steps to have the counter affidavit placed on record. A copy of the same will be served to the counsel for the petitioner.

6. Issue court notice to respondent no. 7, 9, 13 to 16 and 18.

7. Since, counsels for respondent no. 8, 11, 17 and 12 are present in court, they are given six weeks to file their counter affidavits in the matter.

8. Similar liberty is given to those respondents to whom court notice is issued. Copy of the order passed today will accompany the notice.

9. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

10. List on 23.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.

MAY 07, 2018
ds/rd

$~28

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8528/2011

BHARAT STORES ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajiv Khosla and Mr. Tejinder Singh, Advocates

versus

GNCT OF DELHI AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi, ASC for GNCTD with Mr. Shashank S. Tiwari, Advocate

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. No time left, it is already 5:30 PM.

2. List this matter in the category of after notice miscellaneous matter on 30.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.

MAY 07, 2018
ds/rd

$~27

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6203/2011 & CM APPL. 12522/2011,
CM APPL. 20925/2015
RANHOLA MANUFACTURER
ASSOCIATION & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Satyakam, Standing Counsel, Govt. of NCT of Delhi

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **07.05.2018**

1. List along with W.P.(C) 3307/2008.

2. In the meanwhile, Mr. Satyakam will place the status report on the record. It is made clear that the copy of the status report will be served on counsel for the petitioner.

3. Renotify the matter on 26.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.

MAY 07, 2018
ds/rd

$~26

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3307/2008 & CM APPL. 4493/2011, CM APPL. 6267/2011

NANGLI SAKRAWATI SMALL SCALE INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION (REGD.) & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Malini Sud, Mr. Vikas Mishra, Mr. Shashwat Tripathi and Ms. Shaleen Srivastava, Advocates

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Satyakam, Standing Counsel, Govt. of NCT of Delhi

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **07.05.2018**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that interim protection has been granted in a connected writ raising a similar issue i.e, W.P.(C) 6203/2011.

2. To be noted, according to the petitioner the interim order was passed as far back as on 26.8.2011.

3. In these circumstances, respondents are put to notice that if any coercive steps are to be taken against the petitioner they will approach the court in the first instance.

4. In the meanwhile, Mr. Satyakam will place GNCTD's status report on the record. It is made clear that the copy of the status report will be served on the counsel for the petitioner.

5. Renotify the matter on 26.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.

MAY 07, 2018/ds/rd

$~24

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2086/2016 & CM. APPL. 8938/2016

MARUTI SUZUKI INDIA LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. P. Chidambaram, Senior Advocate with Mr. Rajshekhar Rao, Ms. Smarika Singh and Ms. Shreya, Advocates

versus

COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Vaibhav Gaggar, Ms. Sumedha Dang and Mr. Arjun Kant, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Mr. P. Chidambaram, learned Senior Advocate says that the captioned Writ Petition is interlinked with W.P. (C) 6610/2014 which pending adjudication before the Division Bench.

2. Furthermore, Mr. Chidambaram draws my attention to order dated 15.3.2016, whereby, this court has directed that no coercive action be taken against the petitioner. Learned counsel says that this order has continued till today.

4. Mr. Vaibhav Gaggar who appears for the respondent informs me that the constitutional validity of the Competition Act, 2002 has been assailed in the writ petition pending before the Division Bench.

5. In the circumstances renotify the matter on 25.10.2018.

6. Interim order dated 15.3.2016 is made absolute during the pendency of the captioned Writ petition.

7. CM. APPL. 8938/2016 is accordingly disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018
rd/ds

$~23

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7026/2015 & CM. APPL. 12878/2015, CM. APPL. 18072/2015

NCM (INDIA) LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Senior Advocate with Mr. Amitabh Chaturvedi and Mr. Himesh Thakur, Advocates

versus

AIR INDIA LTD. & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Advocate
Ms. Anjana Gosain, Ms. Rabiya Singh Thakur and Ms. Shalini Nair, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Apart from anything else Mr. Amit Sibal, learned Senior Advocate says that a show cause notice (SCN) has been issued by a subordinate of the person against whom the allegations of corruption were made by the petitioner. It is in this behalf stated that SCN was issued by respondent No.4, who is the subordinate of respondent No.2, against whom allegations of corruption were made by the petitioner.

2. Mr. Mukesh Kumar, who, appears for the respondent no. 1 to 5 says that he will obtain instructions in the matter.

3. In the meanwhile, those respondents who have not filed their

counter affidavits will do so within four weeks. Rejoinder, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify the matter on 25.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018
ds

$~21

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7691/2009 & CM. APPL. 3879/2009, CM. APPL. 19613/2016

ISHWAR SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. K.K. Nangia, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajan Sabharwal, Standing Counsel for NDMC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Learned proxy counsel for the petitioner seeks a short accommodation on the ground that the main counsel is in personal difficulty. The request is not opposed by the counsel for the respondents.

2. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 16.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.

MAY 07, 2018
ds

$~19 & 20

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11821/2016 & CM. APPL. 46623/2016, CM. APPL. 20319/2017, CM. APPL. 25224/2017

UNION OF INDIA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC

versus

COMMODORE PK BANERJEE ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Pritika Kumar and Ms. Ishita Bisht, Advocates

\+ W.P.(C) 1268/2017 & CM. APPL. 5741/2017, CM. APPL. 3744/2018

UNION OF INDIA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC

versus

COMMODORE PK BANERJEE ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Pritika Kumar and Ms. Ishita Bisht, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Ms. Pritika Kumar seeks an accommodation in the matter. The request is not opposed by Mr. Kirtiman Singh, counsel for the petitioner.

2. In the meanwhile, counsel for the parties will file their written submissions not exceeding three pages each.

3. Renotify the matter on 24.9.2018.

4. Interim order will continue to operate, in the meanwhile.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.

MAY 07, 2018/ds

$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11808/2016 & CM. APPL. 46598/2016

UNION OF INDIA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Ghai, Advocate for Sanjeev Narula, CGSC

versus

LT COL RAJESH MALIWAL ..... Respondent

Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. It appears that notice could not be issue as the process fee was not filed.

2. On steps being taken, fresh notice shall issue to the respondent.

3. Renotify the matter on 17.9.2018.

4. Interim order will continue to operate, in the meanwhile.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018

rd/ds

$~18

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11809/2016 & CM. APPL. 46600/2016

UNION OF INDIA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Ghai, Advocate for Sanjeev Narula, CGSC

versus

BRIG RAKESH SHARMA ..... Respondent

Through: (Appearance not given)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Mr. Abhishek Ghai says that Mr. Narula has been recently appointed in the matter as counsel for the petitioner. Counsel seeks time to file a rejoinder in the matter. Time for this purpose was given far back as on 14.9.2017.

2. Further time is given subject to cost of Rs. 2,000/-.

3. Renotify the matter on 17.9.2018.

4. Interim order will continue to operate, in the meanwhile.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.

MAY 07, 2018
rd/ds

$~16

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8121/2017 & CM. APPL. 33399/2017, CM. APPL. 2423/2018

GOVIND RAM ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Mr. B. Tripathy and Mr. Randhir Pandey, Advocates

versus

GOVT. OF NCT DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Sanjay Singh, Advocates for DDA
Mr. Mukesh Gupta for SDMC with Ms. Shashi Gupta, Advocates for R-4
Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi, Advocate for R-1 & R-5 to R-8.
SI S.K. Singh, P.S. Fateh Pur Beri, South District, New Delhi

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM. APPL. No. 2423/2018

1. Mr. Naresh Kaushik informs me that despite directions contained in order dated 6.2.2018, respondent no. 1 has not filed its status report.

1.1 To be noted, respondent no. 4 & 5 to 8 have filed their status report.

1.2 There is, though, no representation on behalf of respondent no.

2. Issue court notice to respondent no. 1/GNCTD standing

counsel.

3. At this stage, Mr. Tripathi appears for respondent no. 1 and states that he will obtain instructions in the matter and file the status report within the next three weeks.

6. Accordingly, rejoinder, thereto if any, be file before the next date of hearing.

7. Renotify the matter on 5.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018
rd/ds

$~15

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6484/2017 & CM. APPL. 26884/2017, CM. APPL. 9488/2018

M/S. A2Z INFRA ENGINEERING LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. T.K. Ganju, Senior Advocate with Ms. Divya Bhalla and Mr. Dhritiman Roy, Advocates

versus

POWER GRID CORPORATION OF INDIA LTD. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. S.B. Upadhyay, Senior Advocate with Mr. Pawan Upadhyay, Mr. Nishant Kumar, Mr. Rajesh Chhetri and Ms. Meenakshi Rawat, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. At request of Mr. T.K. Ganju, list on 8.5.2018 at 2:30 PM.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018
rd/ds

$~14

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4309/2017

NARI UTHAN SAMITI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Baniwal, Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Mishra and Mr. Manish, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Abha Malhotra and Mr. Hemant Chawla, Advocates for R-1
Ms. Warisha Farasat, Advocate for R-2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Ms. Warisha Farasat appears for the respondent no. 2 and says that she does not wish to file counter affidavit in the matter.

2. Ms. Abha Malhotra, who, appears for respondent no. 1 seeks further time to file a counter affidavit. The request is acceded subject to payment of cost of Rs. 5,000/-.

3. Counter affidavit be filed within a period of 6 weeks from today. Rejoinder, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Proof of cost be placed on record.

5. Renotify the matter on 12.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018
rd/ds

$~12

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11810/2016 & CM. APPL. 29718/2017

M/S SARVOTTAM INDUSTRIES LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Ankita Bajpai and Mr. Sumesh Dhawan, Advocates

versus

STATE BANK OF BIKANER AND JAIPUR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ishaan Verma, Advocate

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM. APPL. 29718/2017(Restoration)

1. This is an application filed to seek recall of order dated 09.08.2017, whereby, the writ petition was dismissed for non-prosecution.

2. Mr. Ishaan Verma, who, appears for State Bank of India (SBI) informs me that the respondent/State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur stands merged with SBI.

3. Counsels says that he has instructions to appear in the mater on behalf of SBI.

4. Given the aforesaid submission, counsel for the petitioner is directed to take steps to amend the memo of parties. Let the needful be done before the next date of hearing.

5. In case counsel for SBI receives instructions to resist the application, reply will be filed before the next date.

6. In the meanwhile, counsel for the applicant/petitioner will furnish a set of paper book to counsel for SBI.

7. Renotify the matter on 21.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018
rd/ds

$~11

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11594/2016

CONFEDERATION OF RELOCATED INDUSTRIES BAWANA & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Sanjay Singh, Advocates.

versus

DSIIDC AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Nikita Salwan, Advocate for R-1/DSIIDC.
Mr. Ajay Arora, Advocate for MCD.
Ms. Sangita rai with Mr. Pradeep Singh Tomar, Advocates for R-2.
Mr. Amit Bansal, Mr. Abhishek Kumar and Ms. Arushi Gupta, Advocates for R-4 to 6.
Mr. B.K. Mishra, Advocate for R-7.
Mr. Devanshu, Mr. Sumeet Pushkarna and Mr. Vinod Kumar, Advocates for R-8/ DJB.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. It appears that except for respondents no. 1 to 7, other respondents have not filed their counter affidavits. Accordingly, the remaining respondents are given six weeks time to file their counter affidavits, copies of which will be furnished to the counsel for the petitioners.

2. Rejoinder, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. Renotify this matter on 05.10.2018.

MAY 07, 2018/rd/ds **RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.**

$~10

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9066/2016 & CM. APPL. 36727/2016

M/S SURAJ H/L COOP & INDL (PRODUCTION)
SOC LTD & ORS ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajendra Dutt, Advocate.

versus

THE DELHI STATE COOPERATIVE
BANK LTD & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. S. K. Kaushik, Advocate for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. The respondent was failed to file a counter affidavit.

2. Mr. S. K. Kaushik, who appears for respondent seeks more time to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

3 Let a counter affidavit be filed within four weeks, subject to payment of cost of Rs.5,000/- to the petitioners.

4. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Proof of cost will be placed on record.

6. Renotify the matter on 31.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018
rd

$~5

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6187/2010

INDU BALA AGGARWAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ameyavikrama Thanvi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. T. P. Singh, Adv. for R-1.
Ms. Sumati Anand, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **07.05.2018**

1. Counsel for the parties, jointly request for an adjournment as issue arising in the captioned petition also arises for consideration in LPA No. 315/2010.

2. Accordingly, at joint request, renotify the matter on 28.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018
rd

$~50

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4842/2018 & CM. APPL. 18639-18640/2018

ASIAN COLOUR CONATED ISPAT LIMITED ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. P. Chidambaram, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Aaditya Vijay Kumar, Mr. Tanmay Mehta, Mr. Sanskar Agarwal, Ms. Akshita Katoch, Mr. Ajay Kumar and Ms. Vany Sharma, Advocates.

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. H.S. Parihar and Mr. Kuldeep S. Parihar, Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Ankur Mittal and Mr. Abhay Gupta, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. At request of Mr. P. Chidambaram, learned senior counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 17.5.2018.

2. Mr. P. Chidambaram says that in the meantime, steps will be taken to amend the prayer made in the Writ Petition.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018
rd

$~46

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4831/2018 CM. APPL. 18623-18624/2018

TRILOKNATH JHA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashutosh Thakur and Mr. Rajneesh, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi, ASC for GNCTD.
Mr. O. P. Gaggar, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM Appl.No.18623/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4831/2018 CM. APPL.18624/2018

2. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the Writ Petition with liberty to take recourse to an appropriate action in accordance with law.

3. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

4. Consequently, pending application shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/rd

$~45

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4830/2018 & CM. APPL. 18619-18620/2018

SONI JAIN ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. A.K. Jain and Mr. Narender Sharma, Advocates.

versus

HDB FINANCIAL SERVICES LIMITED & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Appearance not given.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM Appl.No.18620/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4830/2018 & CM. APPL. 18619/2018

2. After some arguments learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the Writ Petition with liberty to take recourse to an appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

3 The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed.

4. Consequently, pending applications shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/rd

$~35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4814/2018

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH SECRTARY TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA MINISTRY OF FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL SERVICES ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Maninder Acharya, ASG with
Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC,
Mr. Aditya Goyal & Ms. Kriti Awasthi &
Mr. Sahil Sood, Advs.

versus

SHRI P. RAMAKRISHNA RAJU AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kr. Gautam, Adv. for R-7.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No.18520/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4814/2018 & CM APP No.18519/2018

2. Ms. Maninder Acharya, learned ASG, who appears for the petitioner, seeks a short accommodation to file an additional affidavit in the matter. The additional affidavit, if filed, will be accompanied by the proceedings held before the National Human Right Commission.

3. Renotify the matter on 17.5.2018.

4. It is made clear that there is no stay on the impugned order.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~34

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4807/2018

RAM PARSAD BISMIL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Pandey with
Mr. Manmohan, Advs.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sameer Vashisht, ASC for R-2 & 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18507-508/2018(exemptions)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4807/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Sameer Vashisht, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Learned counsel states that he does not oppose the prayer made in the petition. The substantive prayer made in the petition is as follows:-

> *"A. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ/s in favor of the Petitioner and against the respondent no 2 and 3 whereby directing the respondent no 2 and 3 to make corrections in the revenue record by recording the name of the petitioner Sh. Shirya in the revenue record of land bearing Khasra Number 172/43 Khatauni no. 79/133 measuring (4-16) situated in the area of village Badar Pur Khadar Delhi-110094 and handed over to the petitioner, in the interest of justice."*

4. Learned counsel for the respondents states that the present writ petition may be treated as a representation. It is further stated that the concerned SDM will grant a personal hearing to the petitioner qua which a written notice will be issued to the petitioner. Learned counsel says that the SDM will pass a speaking order within ten weeks from today.

5. The said statement is taken on record. It is ordered accordingly.

6. The concerned SDM will pass a speaking order after hearing the petitioner; a copy of which will be given to the petitioner. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the final determination rendered by the SDM, he will have liberty to assail the same in the manner known to law.

7. Dasti.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~33

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4802/2018

SH. SUKHBIR SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gaurav Sarin with Mr. Sudhanshu Tomar, Mr. S.K.Rout, Mr. Abhishek Manchanda, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Prasanta Varma, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Prativa Rani Varma & Ms. Shalu Goswami, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Devesh Singh, Adv. for R- 3.
Mr. Sanjay Singh, Adv. for R-4/DDA.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18479/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4802/2018 & CM APP No. 18478/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Gaurav Sarin, learned counsel, who, appears for the petitioner states that the issue which arises in the present petition is similar to the issue which arises in WP(C) No.3830/2018, titled: *Manish Kumar & Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors.*

4. My attention has been drawn by Mr. Sarin to the order dated 18.4.2018, passed by this court. It appears that the super structure

which the petitioner had built, falls in Khasra Nos.1030 and 1033, situate in Mahipalpur Village.

4.1 To be noted, a part of the structure which falls in Khasra No.1030 has already been demolished.

5. As in the other case, Mr. Sarin, states that the remaining super structure which falls in Khasra No.1033, cannot be demolished even though it is unauthorized by virtue of the enactment of the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provisions) Act, 2011 as amended by the National Capital Territory of Delhi Laws (Special Provisions) Act, 2017.

5.1 Mr. Sarin, thus, states that status quo be maintained insofar as the possession of the petitioner is concerned, qua Khasra No.1030.

6. Issue notice.

6.1 Ms. Prativa Rani Varma, accepts notice for respondent no.1, while Mr. Devesh Singh, accepts notice for respondent no. 3. Likewise, Mr. Sanjay Singh, accepts notice for respondent no.4.

7. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondent no.2. Counter affidavit(s) be filed within four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed by the next date of hearing.

8. Till the next date of hearing, status quo as to the possession, obtaining as of now, shall be maintained.

9. List the matter on 13.11.2018.

10. *Dasti*.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~59

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4873/2018

GURSHARAN JEET GANDHI & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Abhinav Agnihotri, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INIDA & ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18784/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4873/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Shukla, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Counter affidavit be filed within three weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. List on 6th August, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~57

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4861/2018, CM App. Nos.18723-724/2018

RAJEEV JETLY ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashok Chhabra with
Mr. Pawan Sharma &
Ms. Arpita Yadav, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC
with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Mr. Ashok Chhabra, learned counsel for the petitioner states that he will place on record the order dated 19.5.2017 passed by this court.

2. At request, renotify on 14th May, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~56

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9461/2017

SONALI BHAGWATI DALAL AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Ms. Mohna M.Lal, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Abhishek Ghai, Adv. for
Mr. Sanjeev Narula, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM No.18790/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Abhishek Ghai, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. Learned counsel states that in view of the orders already passed in the matters raising similar issues, he does not wish to file a reply. Furthermore, learned counsel for the official respondents states that directions similar to the order dated 22.03.2018, passed in W.P.(C) No. 2472/2018, titled: *Puja Tandon & Anr. vs. Union of India & Anr.* be passed in the present application as well.

4. As noted in the order dated 2.02.2018, the applicants/petitioners appear to have filed an appeal under Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013. It is the stand of the applicants/petitioners that the

said appeal has not been disposed of by the NCLT. The interim directions which were issued qua the applicants/petitioners vide order dated 02.04.2018 expired on 30.04.2018 As at that time CODS-2018 stood extended till 30.04.2018.

5. In view of the fact that the appeal is still pending, the interim direction granted by this court vide order dated 02.04.2018, shall stand extended till the disposal of the appeal by the MCA. The application is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

6. *Dasti*.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~53

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4852/2018

ONS FOODS AND BEVERAGES PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dinesh Mohan Sinha, Adv.

versus

THE REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES NCT OF DELHI AND HARYANA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr.Arun Bhardwaj, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Counter affidavit be filed within three weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. List on 3rd August, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~52

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4849/2018

SAVINDER SINGH SARNA AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Naman Issrani with
Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, Advs.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. A.P.Singh, Adv. for R-1 to 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18651/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4849/2018 & CM APP No. 18650/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr.A.P.Singh, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Counter affidavit be filed within three weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. List on 2nd August, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~51

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4843/2018

MAHESH CHAUDHARY & ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Ms. Aditi Sharma, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR. ..... Respondents
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18642/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4843/2018 & CM APP No. 18641/2018

2. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondents, returnable on 1st August, 2018.

3. In addition, service be effected via private mode as well.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~48

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4835/2018

SHIVANI BHATNAGAR ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Shobhan Mahanti, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18629/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4835/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. List on 31st July, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~43

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4823/2018

B L AGRO OILS LTD ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Abhishek Chakraborty, Adv. for
Mr. Sanjeet K. Trivedi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18544/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4823/2018

3. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of counsel for the petitioner on the ground that a member of the family of his Advocate is taken ill.

4. To be noted, in the present matter, the petitioner seeks to challenge cancellation of the contract awarded to him by the respondent vide impugned letter dated 24.10.2017. A perusal of the impugned letter would show that the contract has been terminated on the ground that upon inspection of the facility of the petitioner it was found its factory did not have an integrated facility for processing,

packaging and storage qua edible oil.

5. Prima facie, the Clause 3(a) of the invitation of on line bids for supply of 6000 metric ton edible oil required the tenderor to possess such a facility.

6. Since a request is made for accommodation on behalf of counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 22nd May, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~30

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4543/2018, CM Appl. No.17603/2018

VIJAY KUMAR SINHA & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Manish Mohan, CGSC with
Ms. Manisha Saroha &
Dr. G.L.Bhatia, Advs. for R- 1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the petitioners. The position was no different on the previous date i.e. 1.5.2018.

2. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

3. The pending application shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~37

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7222/2014

M/S. JAIN BOTHERS ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prateek Kohli, Adv.

versus

DSIIDC ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Satvik Varma & Mr. Lalltaksu Joshi & Mr. Tanveer S. Oberoi, Advs. for DSIIDC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM No.18705/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Satvik Varma, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent. Learned counsel states that he has no objection to the prayer made in the application. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:-

> *"(a)correct the typographical error in para 16 by correcting the figure as referred to in para 16 as Rs. 22,15,160/- instead of Rs. 22,15,16."*

3. For the reasons given in the application, the prayer is allowed. The figure of Rs.22,15,16/- mentioned in paragraph 16 of order dated 13.3.2018 shall read as Rs.22,15,160/-.

3.1 It is made clear that all other directions contained in the order dated 13.3.2018 shall remain unaltered.

4. The application is disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~39

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8263/2017

ALICE EDUCATIONAL TRUST (REGD.) ..... Petitioner
Through: Ms. Shweta, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Jaswant Rai Aggarwal with
Mr. Vikrant Goyal, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Anil Soni with
Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM Appl.No.18704/2018

1. The limited prayer sought in the application is that notice be issued in CM No.7092/2018. The said application has been filed for impleadment of, one, Mr. Bijay Chandra.

2. Counsel for the respondent has no objection to the notice being issued in CM No.7092/2018. Accordingly, the application is allowed.

CM Appl.No.7092/2018

3. Issue notice.

4. Mr. Vikrant Goyal, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent no.1 and Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent no.2. Reply, if any, be filed within three weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. List the application on 8.8.2018.

6. Since, it is stated by counsel for the respondents that a copy of the application has not been served on them, counsel for the applicant/petitioner will do the needful within two days from today.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~60

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4874/2018

M/S RAMESH CHAND GUPTA AND SONS ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pardeep Gupta with Mr. Parinav Gupta & Ms. Mansi Gupta, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Gautam Narain, ASC with Mr. Chirayu Jain, Adv. for R- 1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18786-787/2018(exemptions)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

2. Applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4874/2018 & CM APP No. 18788/2018

3. Issue notice.

4. Mr. Gautam Narain, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and 2. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify on 16th July, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~61

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4892/2018

RISHI PAL SHARMA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Doko Devesh with
Mr. Uopo Singh, Advs.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT DELHI & ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shobhna Takiar, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18842/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4892/2018 & CM APP No. 18841/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Ms. Shobhna Takiar, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. In view of the direction that I propose to pass, learned counsel for the respondents says that she does not wish to file a reply. The substantive prayer made in the writ petition is as follows.

> *"(a) Issue an appropriate writ, direction or order restraining the respondent no.1 and 2 from demolishing the property of the petitioner i.e. H.No.261 situated at Khasra No.128 admeasuring 14 Biswa, Village Asola, New Delhi."*

4. The petitioner claims that the property in the prayer clause (a) of the writ petition is located in Khasra No.128, in village Asola, New Delhi. The petitioner, however, apprehends that the said property would be demolished, as according to him, incorrect demarcation has taken place.

5. To be noted, vide notice dated 3.5.2018, issued by the Government of NCT of Delhi, the office of the District Magistrate, (South), action by the official respondents is to be taken only qua the properties which are located in Khasra Nos.126 and 127, in village Asola, New Delhi. The ownership of which is claimed by the Gaon Sabha. The said land, according to the said notice, stands transferred to the Department of Forest via notification dated 24.5.1994.

6. Counsel for the respondents' states that a representation has been made in this behalf by the petitioner to the concerned District Magistrate.

6.1. My attention in this behalf is drawn to pages 35-36 of the paper book.

7. In these circumstances, the writ petition along with pending application is disposed of with the direction to the concerned District Magistrate to dispose of the representation of the petitioner within the shortest possible time. Pending the disposal of the writ petition, no coercive measures will be taken qua the petitioner's property. The District Magistrate would also accord personal hearing to the petitioner and, thereafter, pass a speaking order. In case the petitioner is aggrieved by the final determination he will be at liberty to assail

the same, albeit, in accordance with law.

8. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~4

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7002/2005, CM Appl Nos.9047, 28130, 29221/2015 & 37338/29016

M/S POOJA METAFAB P. LTD. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajendra Sharma, Petitioner No.2 in person.

versus

DELHI FINANCIAL CORPORATION ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. D. Bhattacharya, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Mr. Rajendra Sharma, petitioner No. 2 is present in person. He seeks accommodation on the ground that a member of the family of his Advocate has taken ill.

2. Request for accommodation is not opposed by counsel for the respondent.

3. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 05.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~8

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7799/2016

PUSHPA GUPTA AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Noopur Singhal, Adv. for
Mr. P.N.Dhar, Adv.

versus

NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI AND ANR
..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Jyoti Taneja, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Request for accommodation is made on behalf of Mr. P.N.Dhar, learned counsel for the petitioners.

2. Request is not opposed by counsel for the respondents.

3. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 16th October, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7490/2015, CM App.No.14278/2015

MURTI DEVI AND ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Smita Maan with Mr. Vishal Maan Advs.

versus

S.D.M. (HAUZ KHAS) AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Naushad Ahmad Khan, Adv. for GNCTD.
Mr. Hashmat Nabi, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. I am informed by counsel for the respondent no.2 that the Delhi WAKF Tribunal has been constituted and is presently functioning.

2. Accordingly, counsel for the petitioners states that while the petitioners are before the Tribunal and the matter is coming up on 1.8.2018, the interim order passed by this Court should operate till that date. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

3. The petitioners will prosecute their matter which is pending before the Tribunal. The interim protection granted by this Court vide order dated 7th August, 2015 shall operate till 1.8.2018.

4. Tribunal will be free to either modify or vacate the order. The interim order will not come in the way of the Tribunal while deciding the matter on merits or at the interim stage.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~42

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4822/2018

SHRI SHIV NARAYAN SINGH ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Indra Charan Tudu with
Mr. Rajvir Singh, Mr. Vipin & Mr. B.L.Rathi, Advs.

versus

THE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Akhil Mittal, ASC for North MCD/R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18543/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4822/2018

3. Issue notice.

4. Mr. Akhil Mittal, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent no.2

5. On steps being taken by the petitioner, notice shall issue to the remaining respondents. In addition, service be effect via private mode as well.

6. Any construction which is made on the subject property will be subject to the final outcome of the writ petition.

7. List on 16th October, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~13

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1320/2017

SURAJ SAHNI & ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. M. Taiyab Khan, Adv.

versus

SUB-DIVISIONAL MAGISTRATE & ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. sachin Nahar, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Kavindra Gill, Adv. for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

At joint request, list on 19th November, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~25

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11287/2016, CM APP Nos.44167/2016 & 8567/2017

LOUIS DREYFUS COMPANY INDIA PVT. LTD. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Pavan Narang &
Mr. Shyam Agarwal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Kumar Sameer &
Ms. Mishti Singh, Advs. for R- 1 to 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

At joint request, list on 30th October, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~1

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2966/2018, CM APP No. 11879/2018

RESIDENT WELFARE ASSOCIATION, POLICE COLONY, ANDREWS GANJ, NEW DELHI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gurpratap Singh with Mr. Junaid, Advs.

versus

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Adv. for R-1 to 3.
Mr. Ashim Sood, CGSC with
Mr. Rhythym, Adv. for R-4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of Mr. Ramesh Singh, learned counsel for respondent nos. 1 to 3. Request is not opposed by counsel for the petitioner.

2. Accordingly, renotify on 28th May, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~58

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4868/2018, CM APP Nos.18779 & 18780/2018

SURENDRA SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Zubeda Begum with
Ms. Mrigna Shekhar, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with
Mr. Kavindra Gill, Adv. for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Ms. Zubeda Begum, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has applied under the new policy, albeit, without prejudice to his rights and contentions.

2. To be noted, I am told the result qua applications made under the new Policy will be out on 16th May, 2018.

3. Mr. Rajesh Gogna, learned counsel for the respondent confirms the said position.

4. Renotify on 23rd May, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~54

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3165/2016

DIJO MATHEW AND ORS ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Azeem Samuel, Adv.

versus

INSURANCE REGULATORY AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF INDIA ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Dipak K. Nag, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18793/2018

1. Learned counsel for the applicants/petitioners states that the same has been rendered infructuous as the order has already been uploaded.

2. Thus, learned counsel for the applicants/petitioners does not press the captioned application. The application is, accordingly, disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~29

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4332/2018

LAKKAVARAPUKOTA NAVYA AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Azeem Samuel, Adv.

versus

MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIS AND ANR.
..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Nikhil Goel with Mr. Gurpreet Hora &
Mr. Ashutosh Ghade, Advs. for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that he has instructions not to press the writ petition.

2. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as not pressed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~44

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4825/2018

NARENDER KUMAR SHARMA & ORS ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Ratneshwar Das with
Ms. Barnali, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC
with Mr. Suraj Kumar, Adv. for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM Appl.No.18547/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4825/2018 & CM Appl.No.18546/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, learned CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. List the matter on 25th July, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~41

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3081/2018

ASHWANI MEHTA ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Siddhartha Nagpal, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Ms. Bharathi Raju, CGSC with
Ms. J.Vijetha, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM No.18691/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Ms. Bharathi Raju, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. She states that she does not wish to file a reply to the writ petition. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:-

> *"A. Allow the instant application by granting 15 days' time to the Petitioner/Applicant in order to comply with the directions of this Hon'ble Court in its order dated 18.04.2018."*

3. For the reasons given in the application, time for carrying out the direction contained in the order dated 18.4.2018 is extended till 15th May, 2018.

4. The application is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

5. Dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~40

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2573/2018

KHURSHID ALAM ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Alok Tripathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM No.18692/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Kirtiman Singh, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Learned counsel states that he does not oppose the prayer made in the application. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:-

> *"a. extend the time to deposit the FDR No.0458169 for Rs.30,000/- dated 06.04.2018 drawn on Oriental Bank of Commerce, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi be for further 2 working days."*

3. The prayer made in the application is allowed for the reasons

given therein and the time for depositing FDR is extended till 15th May, 2018.

4. The application is disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~32

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4799/2018, CM APP Nos.18475-476/2018

DELONG JIANG (THROUGH ITS ATTORNEY HOLDER)

... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES, DELHI AND ANR. ... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the captioned petition with liberty to file a proper petition.

2. Writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for, *albeit*, in accordance with law.

3. The pending applications stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~31

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4604/2018, CM APP No. 17768/2018

AMIT SHARMA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohit Gupta &
Mr. Rameizuddin Raja, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with
Mr.Abhinav Tyagi, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that additional documents have been filed; copies of which have been furnished in Court. It is noticed that the documents filed are not supported by any affidavit.

2 Learned counsel seeks leave to take appropriate steps in that behalf.

3. Counsel for the respondents states that nothing has been served upon him. Accordingly, the copies of the additional documents are returned to the counsel for the petitioner.

3. Renotify the matter on 25.5.2018. In the meanwhile, interim order will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~47

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

\+ **W.P.(C) 4833/2018**

JAIDEEP KRISHNA ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Shobhan Mahanti, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondent

Through Mr. Arun Bharadwaj, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

CM APP No. 18627/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4833/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. List on 27.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/ak

$~2 & 3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4408/2018 & CM APP Nos.17125-26/2018

ASIANET SATELLITE COMMUNICATION LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jayant Bhushan, Senior Advocate with Mr. Jayant Mehta, Ms. Shirin Khujuria and Mr. Ayushi Gaur, Advocates.

versus

STAR INDIA PVT LTD ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Senior Advocate with Mr. Kunal Tandon, Mr. Shashank Shekhar and Mr. Prateek Jain, Advocates.

\+ W.P.(C) 4409/2018 & CM APP Nos.17127-28/2018 and CAV Nos.391-392/2018

ASIANET DIGITAL NETWORK PVT. LTD.
AND ANR. .....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Jayant Bhushan, Senior Advocate with Mr. Jayant Mehta, Ms. Shirin Khujuria and Mr. Ayushi Gaur, Advocates.

versus

STAR INDIA PVT. LTD AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Senior Advocate with Mr. Kunal Tandon, Mr. Shashank Shekhar and Mr. Prateek Jain, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 07.05.2018

1. Renotify the matter on 9.5.2018, for further proceedings.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 07, 2018/cks

$~13

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9323/2016

M/S ESSENCE INFRASTRUCTURE PVT. LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. I.S. Dahiya, Adv

versus

SUB-REGISTRAR-V (DISTRICT SOUTH) .... Respondent

Through: Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Adv

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. The limited grievance of the petitioner is that he has not received back the sale deed presented by it, for registration as far back as on 21.10.2010, vide receipt no. 31726.

2. Ms. Kaur, who appears on behalf of the respondents, says that prior to her being engaged in the matter, a Status Report was filed on behalf of the respondents which, according to her, needs to be updated. Ms. Kaur says that uptil now it has not been possible to trace the sale deed presented by the petitioner.

3. Given the time lag, the respondent is directed to ensure that the sale deed is traced by the next date of hearing. In case, he is unable to trace the same, he will remain present in the court and render his explanation as to why he is not been able to trace the sale deed.

4. The concerned SDM i.e. SDM Kalkaji, who, I am told, is the supervising authority will also look into the matter.

5. Ms. Kaur will furnish a copy of the order passed today to the Sub Registrar (V) as also to the SDM (Kalkaji).

6. In case, the sale deed is not traced, the SDM (Kalkaji) will also remain present in the court on the next date of hearing.

7. Renotify the matter on 23.07.2018.

8. Dasti.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
c

$~11

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9772/2015 & CM APPL 23470/2015

SHIKHA GUGNANI & ANR. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Mukul Dhawan, Adv

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DLEHI & ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Satyakam, Additional Standing Counsel for Respondent No. 1 with Mr. Vinod Kumar, DC, O/o Commissioner of Industries, GNCTD.
Ms. Nikita Salwan with Ms. Renuka Arora, Advs for Respondent No. 2
Ms. Gauri Chaturvedi, proxy counsel for Mr. Dhanesh Relan, Standing Counsel for DDA
Ms. Renuka Arora with Mr. Sumit Rana, Advs for DSIIDC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Mr. Dhawan, who appears for the petitioners, says that there is a limited relief which is outstanding qua them. It is stated that though the mutation of the subject property has been carried out by DSIIDC, the conversion from leasehold to freehold has not been done.

2. Mr. Dhawan, further submits, that the requisite charges for the purposes of conversion have already been deposited with DSIIDC.

3. I must indicate that Ms. Gauri Chaturvedi, who appears for the DDA, says that since DDA is the landowning agency and therefore, the lessor of the subject property, the charges deposited by the petitioners for the purposes of conversion with DSIIDC should be transmitted to DDA.

4. Mr. Satyakam, who appears for the GNCTD, opposes this submission advanced by DDA's counsel.

5. Ms. Arora, on the other hand, supports the submissions of Mr. Satyakam. Furthermore, Ms. Arora relies upon the provisions of Section 4(ii)(a) and Section 8(2) of the Delhi Industrial Development Operation and Maintenance Act, 2010 ("2010 Act"). Based on these provisions, Ms. Arora contends that the money received towards conversion charges can remain only with DSIIDC.

5.1 Ms. Arora, however, does not dispute the fact that the petitioners have deposited the requisite charges for conversion with DSIIDC.

5.2 Having said so, Ms. Arora enters a caveat, which is, that, if any, additional charges are required to be deposited the same should also be deposited by the petitioner if the court were to direct for conversion of the subject property.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that while the adjudication of the issue as to who should retain the charges which have deposited by the petitioner for the purposes of conversion can be decided at a later date, the petitioners in the

meanwhile should not be put to trouble by delaying the conversion of the subject property from leasehold to freehold.

7. This is, especially so, as I am informed by Mr. Dhawan that the conversion charges were deposited as far back as in July, 2013. As indicated above, Ms. Arora does not dispute this fact. She says that there could be some additional charges that may have to be paid by the petitioners.

8. Having regard to the aforesaid, DSIIDC is directed to convert the subject property from leasehold to freehold.

9. A conveyance deed will be executed in favour of the petitioners. In case, additional charges have to be paid, the petitioners will deposit the same upon DSIIDC giving them due intimation. Furthermore, if any other formalities are required to be fulfilled, the petitioners will also comply with the same.

10. The needful will be done by DSIIDC within eight weeks from today.

11. Insofar as the conversion charges received from the petitioners are concerned, they will be deposited in a no-lien interest bearing Account by DSIIDC. As to which entity will finally enjoy the benefit of the same, shall be determined upon final adjudication of the writ petition.

12. Renotify the matter on 12.10.2018.

13. *Dasti.*

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
c

$~12

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8451/2016

M/S COSMOPLITAN TECHNOFAB TEXTILES P LTD ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prince Wadhwa, Adv

versus

DIRECTORATE OF REVENUE INTELLIGENCE DELHI ZONAL UNIT NEW DELHI ..... Respondent

Through; Mr. Satish Aggarwala, Senior Standing Counsel, Indirect Taxes, Department of Revenue

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Counsel for petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the captioned petition.

2. Mr. Aggarwala, who appears for respondent does not oppose to the prayer made.

3. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn as prayed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
c

$~53

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6484/2017& CM APPLs. 26884/2017& 9488/2018

M/S. A2Z INFRA ENGINEERING LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. TK Ganju, Senior Advocate with Ms. Divya Bhalla and Mr. Dhriti Man Roy, Advs

versus

POWER GRID CORPORATION OF INDIA LTD. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. S. B. Upadhyay, Senior Advocate with Mr. Pawan Upadhyay, Mr. Nishant Kumar and Mr. Rajesh Chhetri, Advs

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Upon hearing the matter, I had asked Mr. TK Ganju, learned senior counsel, who appears for the petitioner to take instructions with regard to certain aspects arising in the case.

2. Mr. Ganju has returned with instructions. He says that the petitioner will be satisfied, if writ petition is disposed of with observation that the expression *"blacklisted/debarred/banned"* which finds mentioned in para 16 of the impugned communication dated 06.06.2017 is substituted with the word *"excluded"* in terms of section 3(2) of the Integrity Pact.

3. Mr. Upadhyay says that he cannot but submit that this will not materially impact the respondent corporation's stand in the writ petition.

4. It is ordered accordingly.

5. Mr. Ganju says that the impugned communication dated 06.06.2017 is coming in the way of the petitioner biding for other contracts with entities other than the respondent corporation.

6. According to me, this apprehension is to say the misplaced as a careful reading of the communication dated 06.06.2017 would show its applicability is limited to contracts pertaining to the respondent corporation.

7. The writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms as prayed by Mr. Ganju.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
c

$~33

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2511/2018

L.N. MALVIYA INFRA PROJECTS PVT. LTD..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Nandadevi Deks, Adv

versus

NATIONAL HIGHWAY AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajeev Bansal, Senior Advocate with Ms. Suruchi Suri, Advs for Respondent No. 1 and 2 with Mr. Pradeep Sharma, General Mananger (Tech.) and Mr. Anil Kumar Jha, Junior Manager (Legal)
Ms. D Soumya Priyadarshinee, Adv for NHAI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM APPL No. 18824/2018

1. This is a joint application moved by the writ petitioner and respondent no. 1 and 2.

2. To be noted, respondent no. 3 is represented by Ms. D Soumya Priyadarshinee.

3. The prayer made in the application is as follows:-

" a) take on record the Minutes of Meeting dated 02.04.2018, and make the same an order of the Court."

4. Ms. Nandadevi Deks, who appears for the petitioner and Mr. Rajeev Bansal, who appears on behalf of respondent no. 1 and 2 submit that the prayer made in the application be allowed and the Minutes of Meeting dated 02.04.2018 be taken on record.

5. It is ordered accordingly. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 2511/2018

6. Ms. Nandadevi Deks, who appears for the petitioner says that in view of orders passed in CM. APPL. No. 18824/2018, she has instructions to withdraw the petition.

7. The petition is, consequently, dismissed as withdrawn.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
c

$~22

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2354/2018 & CM APPL No. 9901/2018

M/S KUMAR TRAVELS ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Subhash Chandran Kumar, Adv

versus

PROTECTOR GENERAL OF EMIGRANTS ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Malika Haremath, Adv

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. On joint request of both the parties, renotify the matter on 04.09.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018

c

$~37

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4875/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.18789

SANJEEV CHOPRA AND ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, Mr. Shaurya Sahay and Mr. Kumar Abhishek, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Shadan Farasat and Mr. Ahmed Said, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **08.05.2018**

1 Issue notice.

2. Mr. Farasat accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3 Counter affidavit will be filed within four weeks from today.

4 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5 Renotify the matter on 13.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~29

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6436/2016

M L SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through Petitioner with his counsel Mr. R.K. Saini, Adv.

versus

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC with Ms. Mahamaya Chatterjee, Adv for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **08.05.2018**

1 Arguments heard.

2 Judgment reserved.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~28

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4283/2016 & C.M. Appl. No.18071/2016

PREET NAGAR RESIDENTS WELFARE ASSOCIATION

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Harish Malhotra, Sr. Adv with Mr. Vikas Arora and Ms. Radhika Arora, Advs.

versus

REGISTRAR OF SOCIETIES & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Vivek Kumar Tandon, Adv for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **08.05.2018**

1 There is no representation on behalf of ROC

2 No time left. It is already 05:10 PM.

3 Renotify the matter on 17.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~27

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8351/2015 & C.M. Appl. No.18977/20165

SATHIYAM MEDIA VISION PVT. LTD. & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Robin R. David, Mr. A. Gupta, Mr. Chitranshul A. Sinha, Mr. Dhiraj Phillip and Mr. Disha Gupta, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Gaurav Rohilla and Mr. Nikhil Bhardwaj, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1 No time left. It is already 05:00 PM.

2 Renotify the matter on 04.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~25

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6582/2014

AMARJEET SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Pavit Singh Katoch, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, CGSC with Ms. Tejaswita, Adv with Mr. B.C. Rathore, Dy. Registrar, Mr. Hemant, Sr. Examiner for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1 Learned counsel for the parties will submit their written submissions not exceeding two pages each. The same will be filed two days before the next date of hearing.

2 Renotify the matter on 24.05.2018

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~23

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5862/2012

DILIP G. SHAH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Anand Grover, Sr. Adv with Ms. N. Rao, Adv.

versus

THE UNION OF INDIA THROUGH THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Jaswinder Singh, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1 Mr. Grover seeks accommodation in the matter. Request is not opposed by the counsel for the respondents.

2 Accordingly, renotify the matter on 16.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~16

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1491/2017 & C.M. Appl. Nos.6819-20/2017

ANUPAM KHANNA

..... Petitioner

Through Petitioner with his counsel Mr. Atul Kumar, Adv.

versus

SHRI RAJ MOHAN KHANNA

..... Respondent

Through Respondent No. 1 in person.
R-2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1 Heard counsel for the petitioner as well as respondent No. 1. There appears to be a marital discord between respondent No. 1 and his wife who is arrayed as respondent No. 2. The petitioner is the son of respondent No. 1 and respondent No. 2.

2 Accordingly, as prayed, parties and their counsel are directed to appear before the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre at 03:00 PM on 24.05.2018. The Mediator shall file his report before the next date of hearing.

3 In the meanwhile, learned counsel for the petitioner will furnish a set of paper book to respondent No. 1. Needful be done within one week from today.

4 List the matter in Court on 03.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~19

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4609/2017

DEWAN HOUSING FINANCE CORPORATION LTD

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Anandita Singh, Adv.

versus

RAHUL PURI & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Davinder Hora, Mr. Sikandar Khan and Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.18805/2018

1 This is an application to bring on record the legal heirs of respondent No.3 i.e. Tripta.

2 Mr. Davinder Hora, who, appears for both respondent Nos. 1 & 3 says that the application is not sustainable as respondent No.3 is very much alive.

3 Ms. Anandita who appears for the petitioner says that this application was moved based on the information supplied by respondent No. 1.

4 To be noted that respondent No. 1 is the husband of respondent No.3.

5 It appears respondent No.3 is alive and, thus, this application cannot be sustained.

6 Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

W.P.(C) 4609/2017 & C.M. Appl. No.20120/2017

7 Learned counsel for the respondents says that he will file a counter affidavit in the matter.

8 Let the needful be done within four weeks. Learned counsel for the petitioner will supply a complete set of paper book within five days from today.

9 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

10 Renotify the matter on 05.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~20

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4792/2017

VANDEMATRAM KUSHT ROGI SEWA SAMITI

..... Petitioner

Through None.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ramesh Singh, Standing Counsel with Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Adv for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1 Ms. Kaur seeks accommodation on behalf of Mr. Ramesh Singh, on the ground that he has taken ill.

2 There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

3 Renotify the matter on 19.11.2018.

4 In the meanwhile, the petitioner will have a liberty to file a rejoinder in the matter.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~18

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4490/2017 & C.M. Appl. No.19608/2017

M/S SCAN SYNTHETICS LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Asmita A. Nayak and Mr. Ranjeet K. Ranjan, Advs.

versus

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF FOREIGN TRADE (THROUGH ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR) & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Abhay Prakash, Ad for R-1 & R-2.
Mr. Harpreet Singh, Sr. Standing Counsel for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1 Mr.Abhay Prakash who appears for respondent Nos.1 & 2 says that a counter affidavit is filed on 07.05.2018 vide diary No.126651.

2 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3 Renotify the matter on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~15

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10783/2016 & C.M. Appl. No. 42234/2016

DISHAA OMKUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through None.

versus

DELHI BAR COUNCIL AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Siddharth Sharma, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1 There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

2 Record shows that on the previous two dates, the petitioner was not represented. It appears that the petitioner has lost interest in the matter.

3 Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

4 Pending applications shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~14

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10240/2016 & C.M. Appl. No.40417/2016

M/S NEGOLICE INDIA LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Ms Ankita Bajpai, Mr. Sumesh Dhawan and Ms. Charu Sharma, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Shubhendu Bhattacharya, Adv for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1 Respondent No. 2 is not present in Court today. The petitioner before me, is the "third party" which is opposing furnishing of information sought for by respondent No. 2 under the Right to Information Act, 2005.

2. Mr. Shubhendu Bhattacharya who appears for respondent No. 1/DDA says while the DDA has no objection to the information being supplied, it is the third party i.e., the petitioner which has objection to the information being furnished.

3 In these circumstances, issue Court notice to respondent No. 2.

4 Accordingly, renotify the matter on 13.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10908/2009 & C.M. Appl. Nos.10052/2009 & 10302/2011

APPAREL EXPOPRT PROMOTION COUNCIL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Kuljeet Rawal, Adv.

versus

VIJAY SAREEN

..... Respondent

Through None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1 Mr. Rawal who appears for the petitioner says that an adjournment slip has been moved qua which no objection has been raised by the respondent.

2 Accordingly, renotify the matter on 22.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
A

$~24

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2697/2013

MULTI SCREEN MEDIA PVT LTD ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vijay Sondhi, Ms. Nayamat Sistani & Mr. Sohan Kumar, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra & Mr. M.K.Tiwari, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

At joint request, renotify the matter on 26.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~21

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1963/2018

WG CDR V S TOMAR (RETD) ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajai Bhalla, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA MINISTRY OF DEFENCE & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Barkha Babbar, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

At joint request, renotify the matter on 23.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2941/2017

SHUB NARAYAN SAH & ORS ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.S. Malik, Adv.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Vipul Pankaj Sanghi with
Ms. Ananya Kar Sanghi, Advs. for R-1.
Ms. Arunima Dwivedi & Ms. Preeti Kumar, Adv. for R-2.
Mr. Parvinder Chauhan, Adv. for DUSIB.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

At joint request, renotify the matter on 16.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~26

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2570/2015

MOHAN NAINWAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Akshita Chhatwal with
Mr. Anirudh Ahuja, Advs.

versus

NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION & ORS
..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Puja Kalra, Adv. for R.1 to 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

At joint request, renotify the matter on 1.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~9

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7695/2015, CM No.15085/2018

M/S. GUPTA STORE ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pardeep Gupta with Mr. Parinav Gupta & Ms. Mansi Gupta & Mr. Moazzam Ali, Advs.

versus

GOVT OF NCT DELHI & ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Devesh Singh, ASC(South) with Ms. Sukriti Ghai, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Learned counsel, Mr. Devesh Singh states that he would file a counter affidavit within three weeks from today. The request is acceded to. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

2. Renotify the matter on 7.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~5

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4165/2018

VINSPAR INDUSTRIES AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sanjiv Bahl with Mr. Eklavya Bahl, Ms. Apoorva Bahl & Mr. Pawas Agarwal, Advs.

versus

THE HONBLE LT. GOVERNOR AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC with Ms. Mahamaya Chatterjee & Mr. M.R.Abhinav Goyal, Advs. with Mr. Vinod Kumar, Dy. Commissioner. Ms. Renuka Arora with Ms. Nikita Salwan, Advs. for R-3/DSIIDC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM App.No.16354/2018(exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4165/2018

2. Notice in the petition was issued on 25th April, 2018.

3. Mr. Gautam Narayan, learned counsel, who appears on behalf of respondent nos. 1 and 2 has reverted with instructions. Learned counsel concedes that no hearing in the review petition has taken place after 14th July, 1995.

4. In these circumstances, the writ petition is disposed of with the directions to the respondent no. 1 to dispose of the review petition at the earliest, though, not later than six weeks from today. A copy of the order passed by the respondent no.1 will be furnished to the petitioner. The petitioner will be accorded personal hearing qua which a written notice will be issued to the petitioner. The respondent no.1, will pass a speaking order after hearing the petitioner.

5. Since, huge time gap exists between the passing of the order and the filing of the review petition, the respondent no. 1 is requested to take into account subsequent facts and circumstances which may have arisen, provided they are material and necessary for the disposal of the review petition.

6. Dasti.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~8

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6169/2013

MUKESH KUMAR SHARMA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar Sharma, petitioner in person.

versus

THE PRESIDENT OF SHAHDRA BAR ASSOCIATION & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the respondents. Record shows that on 6.5.2016 a default notice was issued to the President, Shahdara Bar Association. The order further directed that he should remain personally present in Court.

2. Issue fresh court notice to the President, Shahdara Bar Association. He will remain personally present in Court on the next date of hearing.

3. A copy of the order passed on 6.5.2016 will accompany the notice.

4. List the matter on 05.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~7

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4861/2010, CM APP No. 9616/2010

JAWAHAR LAL AGGARWAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Anusuya Nigam, Adv.

versus

M/S CAPITAL METERS LTD. & ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra with
Mr. Mukesh Tiwari, Advs. for UOI
Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Ms. Anusuya Nigam states that she has been recently entrusted with the matter and therefore would require an accommodation.

2. The request is not opposed by counsel for the respondents.

3. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 3rd October, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~4

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3791/2018, CM APP No. 14998-999/2018

YASHPAL SAWHNEY ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajat Aneja with Ms. Vandna Aneja, Ms. Nisha Sahrma & Ms. Chandrika Gupta, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shobhna Takiar with Mr. Udayan Kandelwal, Advs. with Mr. Vinod Kumar, Dy. Commissioner (Indus). Ms. Nikita Salwan with Ms. Renuka Arora, Advs. for DSIIDC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Mr. Vinod Kumar, Deputy Commissioner is present in Court.

2. Ms. Takiar, states that she needs a short accommodation to revert with complete instructions.

3. At request, renotify the matter on 21.05.2018.

4. Mr. Vinod Kumar, Deputy Commissioner, will remain present in Court on the next date of hearing.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~2

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3148/2018

LAXMI TEWANI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Rai with
Mr. Rishi Kumar, Advs.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT. AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Santosh Kr. Tripathi, ASC with
Mr. Shashank Tiwari &
Mr. Parth Vashisht, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Abhishek Vikas, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Upon notice being issued in the writ petition Mr. Abhishek Vikas, learned counsel, who appears for respondent no. 2 has reverted with instructions. As to what those instructions were is noted hereinbelow.

2. The substantive prayers made in the writ petition are as follows:-

> *"(a) Direct the respondent no. 1 to report that the petitioner is the only surviving member of deceased Late Devidass Tewani and/or*
>
> *(b) Direct the respondent no. 2 to remit the lease amount of the deceased husband in the account of the petitioner having account no. 4447000100093183 and/or"*

3. In the context of the above Counsel for the respondent no.2 states that he has instructions to convey to the Court that an enquiry has been made which brought to the light the fact that the petitioner is the sole surviving legal heir of late husband, who had leased the subject property to the respondent no.2.

4. Given these circumstances, counsel for the respondent no.2 states that rent has been released pursuant to the enquiry in favour of the petitioner and that an attempt is being made to execute a fresh lease deed with the petitioner.

5. Having heard the statement of the counsel for the respondent no.2, Mr. Rajesh Rai, learned counsel for the petitioner states that he does wish to press the petition any further. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as not pressed.

6. Statement of counsel for the respondent no.2 is taken on record.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3701/2018

AMIT KUMAR SHRIVASTAVA ..... Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION NEW DELHI ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. The petitioner, who appears in person states that he will move an application for impleadment of the Customs Department, though, an amended memo of parties has been filed.

2 Let the needful be done within ten days from today.

3. List the matter on 3.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018/ak

$~31

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1478/2018

KAMINI DHUPAR AND ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. Awnish Kumar, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Jitesh Vikram Srivastava, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

C.M. APPL. No.17665/2018 (for early hearing)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that he has filed the counter affidavit with the Registry. However, the same is not on record. Learned counsel will take steps to bring the same on record.

2. The matter in the usual course is fixed on 23.05.2018. The said date stands cancelled. Renotify the matter on 06.08.2018.

3. The application stands disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~32

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2365/2018

SUMIT GUPTA AND ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Karanveer Jindal, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Bhagwan Swarup Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep Singh, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

C.M. APPL. No.18812/2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the application.

2. The same is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~34

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4574/2018

SHAILESH GUPTA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Navin Kumar Singh, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that an additional affidavit was filed. It appears that the same is not on record. Learned counsel will take appropriate steps to bring the same on record.

2. Renotify the matter on 08.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~46

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4907/2018

DR. VEENA MATTU ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R. Sudhinder, Ms. Ekta Bhasin, Mr. Anurag Tripathi and Mr. Deepanshu Arora, Advocates.

versus

REVENUE/DIVISIONAL COMMISSIONER GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shobhana Takiar, Advocate for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Ms. Shobhna Takiar accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents says that in view of the order that I propose to pass, she does not wish to file a counter affidavit in the matter.

4. Briefly, the background in which the present writ petition has been filed is as follows:-

(i) The petitioner before me is aggrieved by the fact that there was negligence in transporting her father late Mr. H.N. Kaw from Max Hospital Patparganj to Saket City Hospital.

(ii) Broadly, the grievance is articulated under two heads. First, that the ambulance did not have a functional ventilator. As a matter of fact, the allegation is that the ambulance did not carry an Ambu bag. Second, the personnel, who were accompanying the patient, were not medically qualified. According to the petitioner, the committee enquiring into the matter failed to examine the material on record and consequently reached an erroneous conclusion.

5. It is the petitioner's case that there is a serious infirmity in the enquiry report, dated 9.9.2017. The aspect qua which particular emphasis is laid by Mr. R. Sudhinder, who, appears for the petitioner, is set forth in paragraph 8(iii) of the enquiry report. For the sake of convenience, the same is extracted hereafter:

> *"From the available medical records before the committee, it is established that the condition of patient Sh. H.K. Kaw did not deteriorate during the transportation in the ambulance. As per the discharge summary, Patient's general condition was poor and risk of transportation was explained. At the end of transport patient's Saturation was 93% at 3:40 PM on 25/12/2013, when the patient arrived at Saket City Hospital. The committee observed that as per Saket City Critical Care Initial Assessment, the saturation at Saket City Hospital on 25/12/2013 at 18:09 PM was recorded as 78-80% (Page No.100)."*

5.1 Mr. Sudhinder submits that because the ventilator was not functioning and the Ambu bag was not available, the patient's oxygen saturation level dropped from 100% to 78%.

5.2 To buttress this submission, my attention is drawn to Annexure P-4 at page 57 of the paper-book. Learned counsel submits that the committee instead of relying upon the oxygen saturation level, recorded in the said document, relied upon a document filled in by the personnel of the ambulance owner wherein the saturation level of the patient on the day of transportation i.e., 25.12.2013, has been shown as 93%. Learned counsel draws my attention to the fact that the signatures of the petitioner were not obtained on the said document.

6. I am also informed by counsel for the petitioner that a representation has been made for review of the inquiry report *vis-a-vis* which detailed submissions have been made in the petition.

7. Counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, says that while there is no mechanism in place for a review, the representation filed by the petitioner can be examined by the Committee.

8. Having looked at the document, which, personnel of the ambulance owner have generated and the said document is marked as Annexure P-4 at page 57 of the paper-book, I tend to agree with the counsel for the petitioner that the apparent discrepancy in the two documents appears to have been missed by the Committee. This aspect is, perhaps, vital to the conclusion that the Committee would reach in the matter.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the Committee to consider the representation of the petitioner. The Committee will hear the petitioner who, herself, is a trained doctor and will record her deposition. The petitioner will be entitled to place before the Committee

any other contemporaneous record that is available with her. The Committee will deal with the petitioner's contentions and thereafter, pass a speaking order qua the representation dated 5.1.2018.

10. Needless to say, this direction is being issued in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the instant case. Furthermore, a copy of the order passed by the Committee will be furnished to the petitioner. The petitioner will be at liberty to assail the same in the manner known to law.

11. The Committee will conclude the aforementioned exercise as expeditiously as possible, though not later than six weeks from today.

12. *Dasti.*

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~1

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

\+ W.P.(C) 136/2018

SH. N.R. SHARMA ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Chandra Shekhar Yadav, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT DELHI AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM. APPL.9948/2018

1. This is an application which seeks recall of order dated 08.01.2018 passed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru.

2. Renotify the matter before the same Bench on 11.5.2018, subject to orders of the Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~51

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4927/2018

SHIV SHANKAR GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gurmehar S. Sistani with Mr. Shakil Akhtar, Advocates..

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjoy Ghose and Mr. Rhishabh Jetley, Advocates for GNCTD.
Mr. Sumeet Pushkarna, Standing Counsel with Mr. Devanshu Lahiry, Advocate with Mr. Pratap Singh (Z.E.) and Mr. V.K. Singh (E.E.), for Delhi Jal Board/R-4.
Mr. Gaurang Kanth, CGSC with Ms. Debojyoti Behuria, Advocate for R-5.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM. APPL No.19048/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4927/2018 & CM. APPL No.19047/2018 (stay)

2. Issue notice.

2.1 Mr. Pushkarna, who appears for Respondent no.4/ Delhi Jal Board accepts notice.

2.2 Likewise, Mr. Gaurang Kanth, who appears for respondent no.5, accepts notice, while Mr. Sanjoy Ghose, accepts notice for respondent no.1.

3. Counter affidavit(s) be filed within three (3) weeks from today.

4. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify the matter on 11.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~50

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3290/2017

ROHIT CHAUHAN ..... Petitioner
Through: None.

versus

NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION & ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM. APPL No.19029/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 3290/2017 & C.M. APPL. No.19028/2018

2. There is no representation on behalf of the parties.

3. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 11.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~49

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4920/2018

NCCF LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. V.P. Singh, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Anju Bhattacharya, Ms. Nandita Chandra and Mr. Abhimanyu Singh Khatri, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Maninder Acharya, ASG with Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, CGSC, Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Mr. Sahil Sood, Ms. Tejaswita, Mr. Harshul Choudhary and Mr. Viplav Acharya, Advocates for UOI with Mr. Anil Bahugula, Joint Sec.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

At request of learned ASG, renotify the matter on 9.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~45

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4906/2018

COMPETENT AUTHORITY AND ADMINISTRATOR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nikhil Bhardwaj, advocate for Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, CGSC.

versus

NAVITA AGGARWAL ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM. APPL. Nos.18874-75/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4906/2018 & CM. APPL. No.18873/2018

2. Mr. Nikhil Bhardwaj seeks accommodation in the matter on the ground that the main counsel i.e., Mr. Arun Bhardwaj is not well.

3. At request, renotify the matter on 3.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~43

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4900/2018

PEEYUSH AGGARWAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas Arora and Ms. Radhika Arora, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Maninder Acharya, ASG with Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC with Mr. Viplav Acharya, Ms. Mallika Hiramath, Mr. Sahil Sood and Mr. Harshul Choudhary, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM. APPL.18859/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4900/2018

2. Counsel for the petitioner says that the co-defendant's petition is pending adjudication before the Division Bench. For this, purpose, my attention has been drawn to the orders dated 01.12.2017 and 28.02.2018, annexed at page 286 to 288 and appended as Annexure H & I.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks interim protection.

3.1 The record shows that no application has been moved for this purpose.

4. Issue notice.

4.1 Mr. Mahajan accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three (3) weeks from today.

6. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

7. Renotify the matter on 19.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~42

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2902/2018

EXCISE COMMISSIONER AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: None.

versus

M/S SANJAY GOYAL ..... Respondent

Through: Mrs. Rana Parveen Siddiqui, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM. APPL.18936/2018

1. This is an application filed by applicant/ respondent seeking exemption for filing a certified copy.

2. The prayer made in the application is allowed.

3. The application stands disposed of.

4. Copy of this order will be dispatched by the Registry to the petitioner.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~41

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10485/2009

K.G.SOMANI & CO. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rabin Majumdar, Advocate.

versus

UOI & ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM APP No.18932/2018

1. The petitioner claims that he is 78 years old.

2. Renotify the matter on 15.11.2018, as last item in the category of "*After Notice Miscellaneous Matters*".

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~40

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4890/2018

SHRI KIRAN K. KAPILA AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Dr. Arun Mohan, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Arvind Bhatt, Advocate with petitioner in person.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, Sr. Govt. Counsel for UOI with Mr. Hem Kumar, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Issue notice.

1.1 Mr. Sabharwal accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three (3) weeks from today.

3. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify the matter on 7.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~30

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11344/2017

M/S PSS SECURITY SOLUTIONS THROUGH ITS SOLE PROPRIETOR.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tanuj Khurana, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjoy Ghose and Mr. Rhishabh Jetley, Advocates for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM APP No.18825/2018

1. In view of the position of the Board, the date of hearing cannot be advanced.

2. Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~52

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4933/2018

RAJESH KHURSIJA

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Arveena Sharma and Ms. Kislaya Mishra, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with Mr. Ruchir Ranjan Rai and Mr. Siddharth Singh, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM APPL No.19054/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4933/2018

2. Issue notice.

2.1 Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three (3) weeks from today.

4. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify the matter on 24.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~47 & 48

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4911/2018

NITESH KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES DELHI & ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar and Ms. Santwana, Advocates.

\+ W.P.(C) 4912/2018

RANI SHARMA & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES DELHI & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar and Ms. Santwana, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM APPL Nos.18898-18900/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4911/2018 and CM. APPL.No.18897/2018
W.P.(C) 4912/2018 and CM. APPL. No.18899/2018

2. Issue notice.

2.1 Ms. Santwana accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three (3) weeks from today.

4. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify the matter on 17.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~44

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4901/2018

GULSHAN WADHWA AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pankaj Agarwal, Mr. Arveena Sharma and Ms. Kislaya Mishra, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with Mr. Ruchir Ranjan Rai and Mr. Siddharth Singh, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM. APPL.18861/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4901/2018

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present petition with liberty to approach an appropriate forum.

3. The writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

4. Pending application, if any, shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~39

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4884/2018

GAURAV KHULLAR AND ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Karanveer Jindal, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mrs. Bharathi Raju, CGSC for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM APP No.28828/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4884/2018 & CM. APPL. No.18829/2018

2. Issue notice.

2.1 Ms. Bharathi Raju accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three (3) weeks from today.

4. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify the matter on 14.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~38

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4876/2018

PRAMOD KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES DELHI & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar and Ms. Santwana, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM APPL No.18816/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4876/2018 & 18815/2018

2. At request of counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 13.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~36

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4614/2018

PENGYU DONG & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi and Ms. Preeti Kumra, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Bhagwan Swarup Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

CM. APPL.17824/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4614/2018 & CM. APPL.17823/2018

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that the additional affidavit has been filed with the Registry. It appears that the same is not on record.

2.1 Counsel for the petitioner will take steps to bring the same on record.

3. Renotify the matter on 13.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4613/2018

MR. VINOD GOYAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sahil Gupta, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Gigi C. George, Sr. Panel Counsel for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 08.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that the additional affidavit has been filed. It appears that the same is not on record.

1.1 Counsel for the petitioner will take steps to bring the same on record.

2. Renotify the matter on 10.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 08, 2018
cks

$~39

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4968/2018

DR. N.K. GUPTA ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Prashant Mehta, Mr. Himanshu Kapoor and Mr. Karn Gupta, Advs.

versus

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr. Tarun Verma, Ms. Biakthansangi Das, Ms. Puja Sarkar and Mr. Abhijit Chakravarty, Advs. for R-1
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for R-2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM No.19175/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4968/2018 & CM No.19176/2018

2. The record shows that the proceedings against the petitioner had, *inter alia*, commenced on account of *suo motu* action taken by this Court based on a newspaper report. The information received was converted into W.P.(C) 4086/2017. This writ petition is listed before Division Bench-I.

3. In view of the fact that the captioned writ petition has been filed against the order passed by MCI, pursuant to the triggering of the *suo moto* action, I deem it fit to place the captioned writ petition before

the Division Bench-I.

4. Accordingly, place the captioned writ petition before Division Bench-I, subject to the orders of the Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice.

5. Since the petitioner says that he wants certain interim directions, the matter would be placed before the Division Bench-I on 29.5.2018; however, as indicated above, this will be subject to the orders of the Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
rb

$~35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4944/2017

S.C. MIDHA ..... Petitioner

Through None

versus

LAND & DEVELOPMENT, MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT & ANR ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Jaswinder Singh, Adv. for R-1
Ms. Mini Pushkarna, SC with Ms. Swagata Bhuyan and Ms. Shiva Pandey, Advs. for NDMC/R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM No. 19142/2018

1. Ms. Swagata Bhuyan, who, appears for the applicant/respondent no.2 seeks to withdraw the application with liberty to file an application with better particulars and an appropriate prayer.

2. The application is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
rb

$~32

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4567/2018

JAY POLYCHEM (INDIA) LTD. AND ANR. .... Petitioners

Through Mr. Ashwani Kumar, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Vineet Malhotra, Mr. Saket Sikri, Mr. Vishal Gohri and Ms. Rausham, Advs.

versus

BANK OF INDIA ..... Respondent

Through Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

W.P.(C) 4567/2018 & CM APP No. 19065/2018

1. Issue notice. Mr. Jitendra Kumar accepts notice.

2. Mr. Ashwani Kumar, leaned senior advocate says that a copy of the writ petition and application has been supplied.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent says that since he has received the copy of the writ petition in Court today, he wants to obtain instructions in the matter.

4. The respondent/bank will be at liberty to file a reply to the application.

5. Renotify the matter on 23.5.2018.

6. In the meanwhile, the respondent/bank will maintain a status quo with respect to the impugned order.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/rb

$~51

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4997/2018

SHAILESH KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Navin Kumar, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Issue notice. Mr. Bhardwaj accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. The counter affidavit be filed within three weeks.

3. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify the matter on 20.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
rb

$~48

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4988/2018

VISHAL AGGARWAL ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Mohit Goel and Mr. Aditya Goel, Advs.

versus

MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ANR.

.... Respondents

Through Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, Sr. Govt. Counsel with Mr. Hem Kumar, Adv. for UOI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM APP No. 19231/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4988/2018 & CM APP No. 19230/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Sabharwal accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. The counter affidavit be filed within three weeks.

4. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify the matter on 17.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
rb

$~44

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4982/2018

DELONG JIANG (THROUGH ITS ATTORNEY HOLDER)

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES, DELHI AND ANR.... Respondents

Through Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM APP No. 19222/2018

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4982/2018 & CM APP No. 19221/2018

1. Issue notice. Mr. Bhardwaj accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. The counter affidavit be filed within three weeks.

3. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify the matter on 17.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
rb

$~36

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11362/2017

ARVIND RAJNISH VOHRA ..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Mohit Goel and Mr. Aditya Goel, Advs.

versus

MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS & ANR .... Respondents
Through Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv. for UOI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM APP No. 19205/2018

1. Issue notice. Mr. Shukla accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

2. The substantive prayer made in the application is as follows:

> *"a) Issue clarificatory directions to Respondent No. 2 to accept the Demand Draft submitted by the Petitioner and taken further steps for the compliance of the order dated 21 December 2017 passed in W.P (C) 11362/2017"*

3. Mr. Shukla says that he has no objection to the directions passed in the order dated 21.12.2017.

4. This order was passed by the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru. Via this order, the writ petition was disposed of, *inter alia*,

permitting the petitioner to avail of the benefit of CODS - 2018. The petitioner has approached the Court in view of the stated resistance on behalf of the ROC in accepting the demand draft that he sought to deposit.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that since in matters that were filed after the captioned petition was instituted, a direction was issued for creation of a fixed deposit in favour of ROC a similar direction be issued in this case as well. Accordingly, the petitioner is permitted to create a fixed deposit in the sum of Rs.30,000/- in favour of the ROC and deposit the same with the Registrar General of this Court. Let the needful will be done within a week from today.

6. Mr. Shukla says that his appearance had not been recorded, by the Court, on the last date of hearing, i.e. 22.3.2018. This submission is taken note of. The record will show that Mr. Shukla had appeared on the said date.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
rb

$~14 & 15

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

+ W.P.(C) 853/2018

RAVI LOMOD ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. S.C. Sagar, Adv.

versus

LAWYERS CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT COMMITTEE & ORS ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Sanjay Dewan and Ms. Palak Rohmetra, Advs.

+ W.P.(C) 865/2018

CHUMAN MANDAL ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. S.C. Sagar, Adv.

versus

LAWYERS' CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT COMMITTEE & ORS ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Sanjay Dewan and Ms. Palak Rohmetra, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks and is granted four weeks time to file a rejoinder.

2. Renotify the matters on 22.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/mk

$~13

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

\+ W.P.(C) 831/2018 & CM APP No.3549/2018

HNUNPUII ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. V.P. Sharma and
Mr. S.C. Sagar, Advs.

versus

LAWYERS CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT
COMMITTEE & ANR ..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Sanjay Dewan and Ms. Palak
Rohmetra, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **09.05.2018**

1. Mr. Sanjay Dewan, who appears for the respondents says that he has filed the counter affidavit in the matter. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

2. Renotify the matter on 22.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
mk

$~28

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8477/2011 & CM APP No.15458/2018

GAUTAM MUKHERJI ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Arunav Patnaik, Adv.

versus

AIR FORCE NAVAL HOUSING BOARD THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR GENERAL AND ANR. .... Respondents
Through : Ms. Manisha A. Narain, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **09.05.2018**

CM APP No.15458/2018

1. On the previous date of hearing, notice was issued to the non-applicant. Ms. Manisha A. Narain, who appears for the respondents submits that she has no objection to the prayer made in the captioned application.

2. The prayer in the captioned application is to array State of U.P. as respondent no.3 in the present matter.

3. Issue notice to the proposed respondent i.e., State of U.P. In addition, service be effected by private mode as well.

4. Renotify the applications on 6.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
mk

$~29

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1612/2012 & CM APP No.19168/2018

KSHITIZ KRISHNA ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Rajan Sabharwal, Adv.

versus

AIR FORCE NAVAL HOUSING BOARD ..... Respondent
Through : Mr. Rachit Mittal, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM APP No.19168/2018

1. On the previous date of hearing, notice was issued to the non-applicant. Mr. Rachit Mittal, who appears for the respondent submits that he has no objection to the prayer made in the captioned application.

2. The prayer in the captioned application is to array State of U.P. as respondent no.3 in the present matter.

3. Issue notice to the proposed respondent i.e., State of U.P. In addition, service be effected via private mode as well.

4. Renotify the applications on 06.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
mk

$~11

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11096/2017 & CM APP No.45367/2017

ABDUL NAIM AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Syed Hasan Isfahani, Adv.

versus

DELHI WAQF BOARD AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Tariq Adeeb, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Naushad Ahmad Khan, ASC for GNCTD with Mr. Devesh Dubey, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners says that since the Delhi WAQF Board ("Board") has been constituted, he would like to withdraw the captioned writ petition and prosecute his suit pending before it.

1.2 It is further submitted by counsel for the petitioners that suit lodged with the Board is listed for hearing on 24.9.2018.

1.3 Learned counsel seeks continuation of the interim order dated 13.12.2017, passed by this court, till the petitioners' interlocutory application is taken up for hearing.

2. In these circumstances, the writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to prosecute their suit before the Board. The interim order

dated 30.11.2017 shall continue to operate till petitioners' interlocutory application is taken up for hearing by the Board. For this purpose suit and interlocutory applications will be placed before the Board on 30.5.2018.

2.1 Accordingly, the pending application stand closed.

3. At this stage, Mr. Tariq Adeeb, who appears for the Board, says that the Division Bench of this court in bunch of petitions has issued certain interim directions.

3.1 To be noted, interim orders, if any, passed by the Division Bench have not been placed before me.

4. Given this submission, it is made clear that the respondents will be at liberty to bring to the notice of the Tribunal any such orders passed by the Division Bench of this Court. The Tribunal after hearing the parties will pass an appropriate order which would include the authority to modify or vacate the order dated 30.11.2017

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
mk

$~55

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5011/2018

BIRENDER KUMAR ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Ashok Agarwal, Adv.

versus

INSTITUTE OF LIVER & BILIARY SCIENCE (ILBS) & ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Govind Kumar, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi, ASC, GNCTD/R-2.
Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. T.P. Singh, Adv. for R-3/UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Issue notice to the respondents. Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.2, while Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.3.

2. I am informed by Mr. Agarwal, learned counsel for the petitioner, that the petitioner between 16.4.2018 and 27.4.2018 was receiving treatment from respondent no.1 Institute. It appears that the petitioner was discharged from respondent no.1 Institute on 27.4.2018; whereupon he took treatment with Dr. Hedgewar Arogya Sansthan, Karkardooma, Delhi. Since, he could

not get cured, the petitioner was admitted to Venkateshwar Hospital, Dwarka.

3. Mr. Agarwal refers me to Annexure P-3 which is suggestive of the fact that, according to the Venkateshwar Hospital, the petitioner requires a liver transplant. Mr. Agarwal says that necessary expertise is available with respondent no.1 Institute. Furthermore, Mr. Agarwal says that the sister of the petitioner has given her consent to donate a part of her liver. Mr. Agarwal further says that other family members of the petitioner are also available, if need be for the said purpose, in case the sister's medical parameters do not match with that of the petitioner.

3.1 Mr. Agarwal says that the petitioner requires immediate treatment.

4. At this stage, it is noticed that Mr. Govind Kumar, Advocate, is present in court. Learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.1 Institute.

5. Accordingly, respondent no.1 Institute is directed to admit the petitioner and commence his treatment. The status report, as regards the petitioner, will be filed in court before the next date of hearing.

6. Mr. Agarwal says that the petitioner will make his own arrangements for being transported to respondent no.1 Institute.

6.1 The said statement is taken on record.

7. Renotify the matter on 25.7.2018.

8. *Dasti* under the signatures of Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/mk

$~57

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

CM APP Nos.19341-42/2018 in

\+ W.P.(C) 12093/2016

DALPAT SHARMA & ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through : Mr. Varinder Singh Dhiman, Adv.

versus

DELHI AGRICULTURAL MARKETING BOARD & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through : Ms. Palak Rohmetra, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **09.05.2018**

CM APP Nos.19342/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

CM APP No.19341/2018

2. Issue notice to the respondents. Ms Palak Rohmetra accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. A bare perusal of the show cause notice dated 3.5.2018 would show that it is more in the nature of an order rather than a show cause notice.

3.1 Accordingly, till the next date of hearing, the operation of the show cause notice dated 3.5.2018 shall remain stayed. Reply(s), if any, be filed within four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

4. Renotify on 13.8.2018.

5. Dasti.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/mk

$~1

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1664/2018 & CM APP No.6840/2018

M/S SSANGYONG ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION CO. LTD ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Navin Kumar, Ms. Surbhi Aggarwal, Ms. Rashmeet Kaur and Ms. Arpana Majumdar, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA (NHAI) ..... Respondent

Through : Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Ms. Gunjan Sinha Jain and Ms. Soumaya Priyadarshini, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **09.05.2018**

1. No counter affidavit has been filed as yet. Mr. Mukesh Kumar, who appears for the respondent seeks further time. The request is acceded to, subject to payment of costs of Rs.10,000/-. The costs will be deposited with the Juvenile Justice Fund. The proof of payment of costs will be placed on record. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

2. Renotify the matter on 29.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
mk

$~2

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2392/2018 & CM APP No.9977/2018

HINDUSTAN SCOUTS & GUIDES ASSOCIATES ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Deepak Tyagi and
Mr. Ajay Garg, Advs.

versus

MINITRY OF FINANCE & ORS ..... Respondents

Through : Ms. Manindar Acharya, ASG with Mr. Jasmeet Singh, CGSC, Mr. Harshul Choudhary, Mr. Sahil Sood and Mr. Viplav Acharya, Advs. for R-1,2 &4.
Mr. Anil Kumar Sangal and Mr. Siddharth Sangal, Advs. for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **09.05.2018**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the writ petition as it has been filed by a person who lacks the authority to institute the action on behalf of the petitioner.

2. The captioned writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn as prayed.

3. Accordingly, the pending application shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
mk

$~53

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

\+ W.P.(C) 136/2018 & CM APPL. 9948/2018

SH. N.R. SHARMA ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT DELHI AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of the applicant. Adverse orders are deferred.

2. Renotify the matter on 24.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
c

$~49

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4991/2018

JAGDIP KAUR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Bhagat, Adv

versus

BANK OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajat Arora with Mr. Niraj Kumar, Advs for Respondent no. 1

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM APP No. 19250/2018 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4991/2018

2. Issue notice.
3. Mr. Rajat Arora accepts notice on behalf of respondent no. 1
4. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within four weeks.
5. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.
6. In addition, service be effected via electronic e-mail as well.
7. Renotify the matter on 20.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
c

$~47

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4986/2018

TAXAB THROUGH (SH PARMESH RANJAN) ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Piyush Hans, Adv

versus

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM APP No. 19228/2018 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4986/2018

2. For the moment, notice is issued to respondent no. 1 i.e. Central Information Commission.

3. It is the say of the counsel for the petitioner that his appeal has not been taken up for hearing, though it was filed as far as back on November, 2017.

4. In addition, service be effected by private mode as well.

5. Renotify the matter on 31.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
c

$~46

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4985/2018 & CM APPL. 19226/2018

RAJ KUMAR RAGHAV ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.K. Saini with Mr. Ayush Arora, Advs

versus

THE DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, DELHI AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Shobhana Takiar with Mr. Udayan Khandelwal, Advs for R3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM APP No. 19227/2018 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4985/2018

2. Mr. Saini needs some time to place relevant judgments on record.

3. Clearly, the petitioner is a licencee who is continuing even according to him for 22 years in the subject property.

4. Since Mr. Saini is not ready with the judgments, renotify the matter on 23.07.2018.

5. Any action taken hereafter will be subject to the outcome of writ petition.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
c

$~45

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4984/2018

CHANDERKANTA KHANNA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Joydeep Mazumdar with Mr. Rohit Dutta and Ms. Priyata Chakraborty, Advs

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Megha Bharara with Ms. Nidhi Raman, Advs for Respondent No. 1 and 8.
SI Yashpal, P.S. Kalkaji

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM APP No. 19225/2018 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4984/2018

2. The record shows that the petitioner had approached this court by way of a writ petition which was numbered as WP(C) 4032/2018. The said petition was withdrawn on 23.04.2018 with liberty to file a fresh petition.

3. However, the order dated 23.04.2018 is not on record. Though, an averment has been made in that behalf in paragraph 35 of the captioned petition.

4. Mr. Joydeep Mazumdar, who appears for the petitioner says that the petitioner has been constrained to approach this court as the concerned Tribunal is not functioning on account of the lack of quorum. This position seems to have obtained since 29.08.2017.

5. Issue notice.

6. Ms. Megha Bharara accepts notice on behalf of respondent no. 1 & 8.

7. Learned counsel says that she will revert with instructions with regard to functioning of the Tribunal.

8. In the meanwhile, notice shall issue to the remaining respondents. In addition, service be effected via private mode as well.

9. Renotify the matter on 29.05.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
c

$~43

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4974/2018 & CM APPL. 19185/2018

M/S ALCHEMIST INFRA REALTY LIMITED AND

ANR. ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Sonia Dube with Mr. Saurabh Seth, Mr. Shatadru Chakraborty, Mr. Anurag Singh and Ms.Surbhi Anand, Advs

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC for UOI. Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Adv for R4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of Mr. Rajiv Nayyar. The request is not opposed.

2. Renotify the matter on 16.05.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018
c

$~41

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4972/2018

SH. BALDEV RAJ ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Ujala Vishnoi with Mr. Randeep Singh, Advs

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Shadan Farasat, ASC with Mr. Ahmed Said, Advs for Respondent No. 1 and 2
Mr. Dhanesh Relan, Standing counsel with Ms. Komal Sorout and Ms. Kajri Gupta, Advs for R3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM APP No. 19181/2018 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4972/2018

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Shadan Farasat accepts notice on behalf of respondents no. 1 and 2 and Mr. Dhanesh Relan accepts notice on behalf of respondent no. 3.

4. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within three weeks.

5. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

6. Renotify the matter on 10.09.2018

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/c

$~42

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4973/2018 & CM Appl. No.19182-19183/2018

SUSHIL DINESH SHAH ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Ketan Madan, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES & ORS ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Raksh Kumar, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. No time left. It is already 5.50 p.m.

2. Renotify the matter on 15.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~33

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4642/2018 & CM Appl. No.17909-17910/2018

MR. ANUJ KAPOOR AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ritik Malik with Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Advs.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Vinod Diwakar, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. No time left. It is already 4.46 p.m.

2. Renotify the matter on 17.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~34

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4649/2018 & CM Appl. No.17947-48/2018

DILBAGH RAI CHAWLA AND ANR. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Kumar Chitranshu, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Adv. for R-1 & 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. No time left. It is already 4.45 p.m.

2. Renotify the matter on 15.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~23 to 27

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10468/2015 & CM Appl. No.26265/2015

DR. ALKA GOEL ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Reena George with Mr. Ketan Paul and Mr. Tishar, Advs.

versus

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA & ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. T. Singhdev, Adv. for MCI.
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for R-2.
Mr. Sunil Sirohi, Adv. for R-3.

\+ W.P.(C) 11129/2015 & CM Appl. No.28815/2015

ANU NAYYAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. A.M. Tripathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. T. Singhdev, Adv. for MCI.
Mr. Sunil Sirohi, Adv. for R-3.
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for R-4.

\+ W.P.(C) 11707/2015 & CM Appl. No.31143/2015

DR. GAURAV BANSAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anupam S. Sharma with Mr. Prakash Airan, Mr. Shivam Gupta and Mr. Ankit Vashist, Advs.

versus

DELHI MEDICAL COUNCIL & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. T. Singhdev, Adv. for MCI.
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for R-1.

Mr. Sunil Sirohi, Adv. for R-3.

\+ W.P.(C) 11835/2015 & CM Appl. No.31444/2015

DR. RENU AGARWAL ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Anup K. Kaushal, Adv.
Mr. Sunil Sirohi, Adv. for R-3.

versus

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. T. Singhdev, Adv. for MCI.
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for DMC.

\+ W.P.(C) 12090/2015 & CM Appl. No.32132/2015

V.K. KOHLI ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Nitin Kumar, Adv.

versus

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. T. Singhdev, Adv. for MCI.
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for DMC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. No time left. It is already 4.50 p.m.

2. Renotify the matters on 22.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~21

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2252/2015 & CM Appl. No.4022/2015, 12037/2017

K. MOHAMMED IMRAN ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saurabh Prakash with Mr. Kunal Gosain and Mr. Utsav Jain, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. No time left. It is already 4.45 p.m.

2. Renotify the matter on 14.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~20

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7194/2016 & CM Appl. No.31925, 38174/2016

NASHIK ZILLA CABLE OPERATORS ASSOCIATION & ANR ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Tanvir Nayar with Mr. Anil Thomas, Advs. for Hathway Cable Datacare Pvt. Ltd.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. None appears for the petitioner.

2. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 13.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~18

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1805/2018

YASHVI ENTERPRISES PRIVATE LIMITED ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amol Sinha with Mr. Nitin Gulati, Advs.

versus

RBL BANK LIMITED ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ateev Mathur, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. It is already 4.40 p.m.

2. No time left. Renotify the matter on 23.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~10

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3257/2017

MADHAVI GUPTA ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. None appeared for the parties.
2. Adverse orders are deferred.
3. Renotify the matter on 26.10.218.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~30 & 31

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4408/2018 & CM Appl. No.17125-26/2018

ASIANET SATELLITE COMMUNICATION LTD..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jayant Bhushan, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Jayant Mehta, Ms. Shrin Khajuria, Ms. Ayushi, Mr. Ketan Paul and Mr. Atul Vinod, Advs.

versus

STAR INDIA PVT LTD ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Niraj Kishan Kaul, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv., Mr. Kunal Tandon, Mr. Sai Krishna, Mr. Shashank Shekher, Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Mrs. Sneha Jain and Mr. Ranjeet Singh, Advs.

\+ W.P.(C) 4409/2018 & CM Appl. No.17127-28/2018, Cav. No.391-92/2018

ASIANET DIGITAL NETWORK PVT. LTD. AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jayant Bhushan, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Jayant Mehta, Ms. Shrin Khajuria, Ms. Ayushi, Mr. Ketan Paul and Mr. Atul Vinod, Advs.

versus

STAR INDIA PVT. LTD AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Niraj Kishan Kaul, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv., Mr. Kunal Tandon, Mr. Sai Krishna, Mr. Shashank Shekher, Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Mrs. Sneha Jain and Mr. Ranjeet Singh, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **09.05.2018**

Renotify the matters on 14.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~16

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1512/2018 & CM Appl. No.6182/2018

DR YASHOB SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pradeep Kumar with Mr. Raj Karan Sharma, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Aman Nandrajog with Mr. P.S. Singh and Mr. Ashish Tiwari, Advs. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Counsel for respondent No.1 and 2 seeks and is granted three weeks to file the counter affidavit. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

2. Renotify the matter on 3.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~19

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2715/2018 & CM Appl. No.11033, 19169/2018

OFFSHOOT AGENCY PRIVATE LIMITED ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth Luthra, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Priyanka Sharma Goswami, Ms. Anusuya Sadhu Sinha and Ms. Amrita Sharma, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC for UOI. Mr. Chaitanya Safaya with Ms. Surabhi Limaye and Mr. Vaibhav Niti, Advs. for R-2 & 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Counsel for the respondent No.2 & 3 seeks and is granted further time to file the counter affidavit.

2. Let the needful be done within three weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. Renotify the matter on 10.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~12

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

\+ W.P.(C) 609/2018

PRESS ASSOCIATION ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Aditi Saxena, Adv.

versus

PRESS INFORMATION BUREAU AND ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ashim Sood with Ms. Payal Chandra, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

CM Appl. No.19167/2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Ms. Saxena accepts notice for the non-applicant/petitioner.

3. Renotify the captioned application on 25.8.2018.

W.P.(C) No.609/2018 & CM Appl. No.2672/2018

4. The report of the Registry is that the, counter affidavit has been returned under objection.

5. Mr. Sood, who appears for the respondents, says that he will take steps to have the counter affidavit placed on record. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

6. Renotify the matter on 21.8.2018.

7. In the meanwhile, interim order shall continue to operate till further order of this Court.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~9

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

\+ W.P.(C) 486/2017 & CM Appl. No.2218/2017

NIRMAL TOWER BUILDING PVT. LTD. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Anurag Pratap, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. D. Gupta, Adv. for R-3.
Mr. Anshuj Dhingra with Mr. Kartik Sethi, Advs. for R-4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

At request of the counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 25.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~8

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5690/2016 & CM Appl. No.23532, 24337, 28646/2016

M.N. ASHISH GANJU ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Tara V. Ganju with Mr. Rahul Jaryal, Advs.

versus

DISTRICT URBAN DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (DUDA) & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Prateek Chadha, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Ms. Ganju, who appears for the petitioner, says that while prayer clause (a) stands satisfied, prayer clause (c) and (d) need to be addressed immediately as the monsoon season is around the corner.

2. Insofar as prayer clause (e) is concerned, Ms. Ganju says, for the moment, there is no urgency.

3. Counsel for the respondents will file a status report with regard to the reliefs sought in prayers (c) and (d).

4. Renotify the matter on 31.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~7

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3998/2016 & CM Appl. No.29187/2017

MANISH AGGARWAL ..... Petitioner
Through: None.

versus

CENTRAL VIGILANCE COMMISSION & ORS ..... Respondent
Through: Ms. Tatini Basu, Adv. for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Fresh notice shall issue to respondent No.2 and 3 without process fee.

2. Renotify the matter on 12.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7931/2014

YOGESH CHANDER BHARDWAJ ..... Petitioner
Through: None.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Siddhanth Panda, Adv. for R-1.
Ms. Manika Tripathy Pandey with Mr. Ashutosh Kaushik and Ms. Raveena Tandon, Advs. for DDA.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

2. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 29.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~5

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8141/2011

PUSHPENDER KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil Singal, Adv.

versus

GNCT AND ANR ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of the respondents.

2. Renotify the matter on 25.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~4

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7457/2010 & CM Appl. No.14760/2010

RADHAKANTAPUR LEPROSY ASSOCIATION..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Jayshree Satpute with Ms. Tripti Poddar, Advs.

versus

UOI AND ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Joydeep Mazumdar with Mr. Rohit Dutta, Ms. Priyanka and Mr. Kamlesh Kumar, Advs. for R-3 to 5.
Mr. Prasanta Varma with Ms. Prativa Rani Varma and Ms. Shalu Goswami, Advs. for R-6.
Mr. T. Singhdev with Ms. Baikthansangi Das, Ms. Puja Sarkar and Mr. Tarun Verma, Advs. for R-8.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Mr. Mazumdar, who appears for respondent No.3 to 5, says that the matter be stood over as steps are being taken to move the Supreme Court to seek clarification in respect of orders passed in W.P.(C) No.5363/1990 and the connected matters. Furthermore, learned counsel says that since respondent No.3 to 5 are bound by the provisions of Section 34 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, he will obtain instructions as to whether any notification has been issued in terms of Clause (c) of Sub-section (1) of the very same Section.

2. Counsel for respondent No.3 to 5 also submits that if the said respondents move the Supreme Court, prior notice will be given to the petitioner association and its counsel, i.e. Ms. Jayshree Satpute.

3. Renotify the matter on 4.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1629/2018 & CM APPL. No.6694/2018

GODAVARI NUTRIFOODS PVT LTD ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vikas Singh, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Arvind Nayar, Sr. Adv., Ms. Nanda Devi Deka and Ms. Deepeika Kalia, Advs.

versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. K.S. Parihar with Mr. H.S. Parihar, Advs. for RBI.

Mr. Rajiv Kapur with Ms. Khshboo Kapur, Advs. for SBI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **09.05.2018**

1. Mr. Parihar, who appears for RBI, seeks and is granted further time to file a counter affidavit in the matter. Let the needful be done within three weeks from today.

2. Mr. Vikas Singh, learned Senior Counsel, who appears for the petitioner, relies upon a Circular dated 15.2.2018 issued by RBI, which, according to him, does not put any limit on the acceptance of coins by the banks.

3. Mr. Parihar says he needs to take instructions on this aspect of the matter.

4. To my mind, if the Circular dated 15.2.2018 is in place, as contended by Mr. Vikas Singh, there should be no difficulty in the petitioner approaching the concerned bank to deposit the coins. In case RBI has any objection, it will have liberty to approach the Court.

5. Renotify the matter on 3.7.2018.

6. *Dasti*.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3435/2018 & CM APPL. No.13584/2018

LAWRENCE LIANG ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Akhil Sibal, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Jawahar Raja, Mr. Chinmay Kanojia and Ms. Aditi Pathak, Advs.

versus

AMBEDKAR UNIVERSITY, DELHI (THROUGH: ITS REGISTRAR) AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind K. Nigam, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Abhimanyu Shreshtha, Mr. Nikhil Sharda and Mr. Mehtaab Singh Sandhu, Advs. for R-1.
Ms. Sakshi Banga with Mr. Anas Tanwar, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 09.05.2018

1. Mr. Nigam, learned Senior Counsel who appears for respondent No.1/University, says that the said respondent was unable to file a counter affidavit in the matter, as papers concerning the subject matter are available with the Committee for Prevention of Sexual Harassment (CPSH).

2. Ms. Sakshi Banga has entered appearance on behalf of respondent No.2/complainant.

3. Counsels for the parties are agreed that it may facilitate adjudication of the matter, if the Committee for Prevention of Sexual Harassment is arrayed as a party to the present proceedings. It is ordered accordingly.

4. Counsel for the petitioner will file an amended memo of parties within one week from today.

5. Notice shall issue to the newly arrayed party, i.e. Committee for Prevention of Sexual Harassment.

6. Mr. Nigam says that he will file his written submissions on behalf of respondent No.1. Leave in that behalf is granted to respondent No.1.

7. Counsel for respondent No.2 is given four weeks to file a counter affidavit.

8. Rejoinder, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

9. The Committee for Prevention of Sexual Harassment will stand over its proceedings till further orders of this Court.

10. Renotify the matter on 23.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 09, 2018/pmc

$~3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4433/2018 & CM No.17173/2018

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR GUPTA ..... Petitioner
Through Mr. B.S. Sharma, Adv.

versus

ROSHANARA CLUB LIMITED AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through Mr. Amish Dabas and Ms. Shreya Dabas, Advs. for R-3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1. Issue notice. Mr. Amish Dabas accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.3.

2. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondents no.1 and 2. In addition, service be effected via private mode as well.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner will supply the additional document filed by him, which is a copy of the show cause notice, to counsel for respondent no.3.

4. Renotify the matter on 28.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
rb

$~2

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4027/2018 & CM no.15933/2018

WYETH LLC ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Pravin Anand, Ms. Tusha Malhotra, Ms. Arpita Kulshreshtra, Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Ms. Rashi Punia and Mr. Aditya Awasthi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI with Ms. Anubha Bhardwaj, Adv. for R-1 to 4.
Mr. Saurabh Banerjee, Ms. S. Majumdar, Ms. Mitul Dasgupta and Mr. Afzal Khan, Advs. for R-5.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1. Briefly, the controversy in the present writ petition is as to whether or not the review filed by respondent no.5/ Panacea Biotech is to be heard by respondent no.4.

2. To be noted, two opposition applications were filed qua the patent filed by the petitioner. The oppositions were filed by, one, Ms. Leena Menghaney, who is a petitioner in W.P.(C) 9047/2017 and respondent no.5/Panacea Biotech.

2.1 These applications were heard, and thereafter, rejected by

respondent no.4.

3. Insofar as Ms. Leena Menghaney was concerned, as indicated above, she preferred a writ petition which is pending before this Court and, as a matter of fact, pursuant to the order passed on the previous date in the captioned writ petition, is also placed before me, today.

4. Insofar as respondent no.5/Panacea Biotech is concerned, it preferred the review route. Accordingly, a review petition was filed before respondent no.4.

4.1 It is this review petition which respondent no.4, as it appears, has declined to hear.

5. According to the official respondents, since respondent no.4 has recused from hearing the review petition filed by respondent no.5/ Panacea Biotech, the said petition has been transferred to respondent no.3 by respondent no.2 in exercise of his powers under Section 73(4) of the Patents Act, 1970 (in short 'Act').

5.1 On the other hand, counsel for the petitioner contends that in terms of provisions under Section 77(1)(f) of the Act the review petition should, ordinarily, have been heard by respondent no.4. Learned counsel lays emphasis on the fact that the affidavit filed in this Court on behalf of respondents no.1 to 4 does not disclose reasons for recusal.

6. Given these circumstances, to my mind, it is necessary for respondent no.4 to file an affidavit disclosing therein, the reasons as to why she has declined to hear the review petition filed by respondent no.5/ Panacea Biotech.

7. In this behalf, respondent no.4 will disclose as to whether or not

she has any conflict of interest in the matter, whether of a pecuniary or a non-pecuniary nature.

8. Let the counter affidavit be filed within two weeks.

9. Renotify the matter on 19.7.2018.

10. Under these circumstances, respondent no.3 shall defer the hearing fixed in the review petition which I am told is stated for 16.5.2018. Learned counsel for respondent no.5/ Panacea Biotech says that he has no objection to this to the matter being stood over. The said statement is taken on record.

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
rb

$~40

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1667/2018

RITESH KUMAR VERMA ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Hemant Jain and Mr. Jasmeet Singh, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Vinod Diwakar, CGSC witih Ms. Tatasha Banerjee, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

CM APP No. 19378/2018

1. Issue notice. Mr. Diwakar accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the official respondents says that given the nature of the prayer made in the application, he does not wish to file a reply.

3. The prayer made in the application is as follows:

> "a) Condone the delay of 8 days in filing the Fixed Deposit Receipt."

4. For the reasons given in the application, the prayer is allowed.

5. The application is, accordingly, disposed of.

6. *Dasti* under the signatures of Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
rb

$~41

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7402/2017

KHUMUKCHAM SANJITA CHANU ..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Parth Goswami, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents
Through Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC
with Mr. T.P. Singh, Adv. for R-1

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1. The core issue raised by the petitioner is that for some odd reason weight lifting was not considered as a discipline for conferment of Arjuna Awards either for 2016 or for 2017.

2. In the writ petition, the prayer made is that the petitioner should be awarded Arjuna Award for 2017.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents says that the matter was deliberated upon by the concerned committee, whereupon, it came to the conclusion that no awards would be conferred for weight lifting qua the aforementioned years.

4. It is submitted by the counsel for the respondents that the deliberations of the concerned committee were videographed. Learned counsel for the respondents says that he will file a script as well as the CD of the deliberations with the Registry of this Court. It

is ordered accordingly.

4.1 A copy of the script and the CD will also be furnished to the counsel for the petitioner. Let the needful be done within 4 weeks.

5. I may also indicate that the counsel for the petitioner says that in the recent commonwealth games the petitioner won a gold medal in weight lifting in the 53 kg. category.

6. Given the aforesaid submission of the counsel for the petitioner, the Secretary (Sports), Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports is directed to place the matter before the Minister of Youth Affairs and Sports. The decision taken by the concerned Minister will be placed before the Court.

7. Renotify the matter on 23.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
rb

$~21 to 23

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8110/2010 & CM No. 20894/2010

RAJ PAL KHANNA & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through Mr. Amit Anand Tiwari, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Adv. for UOI

AND

\+ W.P.(C) 8111/2010 and CM Nos. 20897/2010, 6712/2011 & 15015-15016/2015

MURALI MANOHAR TANDON ..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Ashish Tiwari and Mr. Aman Nandrajog, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Adv. for UOI

AND

\+ W.P.(C) 8115/2010 and CM No. 20905/2010

JAWAHARLAL MEHRA & ANR..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Ashish Tiwari and Mr. Aman Nandrajog, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Adv. for UOI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **10.05.2018**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners seek accommodation. The request is not opposed by the counsel for the respondents.

2. Accordingly, renotify the matters on 26.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
rb

$~32 to 34

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

\+ W.P.(C) 944/2011 & CM APP No. 13634/2015

ARVIND POSWAL ..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Varun, Adv.

versus

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents
Through Mr. T. Singhdev, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for R-2.
Ms. Soumya Kumar and Mr. Sanyam Khetarpal, Advs. for R-3

AND

\+ W.P.(C) 4676/2013 & CM APP Nos. 21831-32/2015

ARVIND POSWAL ..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Varun, Adv.

versus

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents
Through Mr. T. Singhdev, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for R-2
Ms. Soumya Kumar and Mr. Sanyam Khetarpal, Advs. for R-3

AND

\+ W.P.(C) 4747/2013 & CM APP No. 21955-56/2015

ARVIND POSWAL ..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Varun, Adv.

versus

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents
Through Mr. T. Singhdev, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Praveen Khattar, Adv. for R-2
Ms. Soumya Kumar and Mr. Sanyam

Khetarpal, Advs. for R-3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks accommodation. The request is not opposed by the counsel for the respondents.

2. Accordingly, renotify the matters on 27.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
rb

$~39

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11599/2015

VEDANTA LIMITED & ORS ..... Petitioners

Through Mr. C.A. Sundaram, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Anuradha Dutt, Mr. Anish Kapur and Mr. Dhritiman Roy, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with Mr. Waize Ali Noor, Mr. Prateek Dhanda and Saeed Qadri, Advs. for UOI.
Mr. K.R. Sasiprabhu and Mr. Ajay Kumar Jha, Advs. for R-3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

CM APP No. 19300/2018

1. Learned counsels are agreed that this application can be disposed of with the following directions:

1.1 The petitioners and ONGC will apply under the new policy dated 7.4.2017.

1.2 The only caveat that the petitioners wish to enter is that the application shall contain an endorsement that it is being filed without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the petitioners. It is ordered accordingly.

2. The application is disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

3. *Dasti* under the signatures of Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018/rb

$~5

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7295/2012

GIAN P. KUMAR (HUF) ..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Dinesh Agnani, Sr. Adv with Mr. Gaurav Bahl and Mr. Ishaan Chawla, Advs.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS. ..... Respondents

Through Mr. Naushad Ahmad Khan, ASC with Mr. Devesh Dubey and Ms. Zahid Hanief, Advs for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1 Mr. Dinesh Agnani has completed his arguments. Mr. Khan has partly argued the matter.

2 Renotify for further arguments on 16.08.2018.

3 Meanwhile, counsel for the parties will file their written submissions not exceeding two pages each.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7103/2013 & C.M. Appl. No.15327/2013

GENX ENTERTAINMENT LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Sneha Jain, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1 Counsel for the parties say that since the SLP No.32182/2014 titled: *Viacom 18 Media Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Union of India* is still pending adjudication, the matter be stood over.

2 Accordingly, at request, renotify the matter on 28.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~7

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3398/2015

JINDAL STEEL & POWER LIMITED & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Aakash Bajaj, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Anumita Chandra for Mr. Sanjeev Narula, Adv for UOI.
Mr. Amit Verma, Adv for SECL.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

C.M. Appl. No.16009/2017

1 Learned counsel for the applicant seeks further time to file a rejoinder. Let the needful be done within four weeks.

2 Renotify the matter on 31.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~8

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8527/2015 & C.M. Appl. No.18371/2015

M/S INDIAN STEEL CORPORATION

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Prabhat Kaur, Mr. Harendra Singh and Mr. R.P. Singh, Advs.

versus

COMMISSIONER OF CENTRAL EXCISE, DELHI-I

..... Respondent

Through None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1 There is no representation on behalf of the respondent.

2 Issue Court notice to the respondent and its standing counsel.

3 Renotify the matter on 13.11.2018.

4 In the meanwhile, the interim order will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~9

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11781/2015 & C.M. Appl. Nos.31323/2015 & 15683/2016

YASHWANT RAI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Chiranjeev Johri for Mr. Pradeep Kumar Mathur, Adv.

versus

THE UNION OF INDIA AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Apoorv Kurup and Mr. G. Kaushal, Advs. for UGC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1 Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks accommodation as the main counsel Mr. Mathur is not available. Request is not opposed by the learned counsel for the respondents.

2 Accordingly, renotify the matter on 27.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~11

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5009/2016 & C.M. Appl. No.20910/2016

CENTRAL BOARD OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Seema Dolo for Mr. Amit Bansal, Adv.

versus

VIJAY KUMAR MISHRA

..... Respondent

Through None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1 There is no representation on behalf of the respondent. Order dated 27.02.2017 says that the respondent was to obtain instructions in the matter as the information sought has already been supplied, according to the petitioner, to the respondent. Adverse orders are deferred.

2 Renotify the matter on 22.11.2018.

3 In the meanwhile, interim order will continue to operate.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~14

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8597/2016

DEEPAK GOEL

..... Petitioner

Through None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Chiranjeev Kumar and Mr. Mukesh Sachdeva, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1 There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

2 Adverse orders are deferred.

3 Renotify the matter on 29.11.2018. In the meanwhile, the petitioner will have the liberty to file a rejoinder in the matter.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~15

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10504/2016

LEARNING MATTERS FOUNDATION & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through Mr A.S. Chandihok, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Chandni Ghani, Ms. Ramya Kutty, Mr. Chetan Lokur and Mr. Devraj Gautam, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1 At request, renotify the matter on 24.05.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4947/2017

PRADYUNN HORA & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Pranjal Kishore, Mr. Atul Shankar and Mr. Vinod, Advs.

versus

THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, GOVT. OF NCT, DELHI

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC for GNCTD with Mr. Anuj Aggarwal and Mr. Abhinav Goel, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **10.05.2018**

1 Learned counsel for the parties will file written submissions not exceeding 3 pages each at least three days before the next date of hearing.

2 At request, renotify the matter on 05.07.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~20

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1710/2018 & C.M. Appl. No.7054/2018

HARISH KAPOOR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Anurag Bhatt, Adv.

versus

THE INSTITUTE OF CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS OF INDIA

..... Respondent

Through Ms. Pooja M. Saigal, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

1 Learned counsel for the respondent seeks and is granted four weeks time to file a counter affidavit.

2 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3 Renotify the matter on 04.09.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
A

$~44

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5061/2018

SATBIR SHARMA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. D.K. Devesh and Mr. U.P. Singh, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. M.S. Shobhna Takiar and Mr. Udayan Khandelwal, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 14.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~43

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9965/2016

DEVINDER ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. D.K. Devesh and Mr. U.P. Singh, Advocates.

versus

THE LT. GOVERNOR & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

CM APPL. Nos.19461-62/2018

Renotify the matter on 14.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~42

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5053/2018

ROSHAN DEVI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. D.K. Devesh and Mr. U.P. Singh, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anupam Srivastava, ASC/GNCTD and Mr. Dhairya Gupta, Advocate for R-1 to 4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 14.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~24

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

\+ W.P.(C) 704/2013

SOCIETY FOR CONSUMERS AND INVESTORS PROTECTION

..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, Advocate for R-1/UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 22.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~25

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3775/2013

USV LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Chandrika Gupta, Advocate.

versus

THE UNION OF INDIA & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narula, CGSC with Ms. Anumita Chandra, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 13.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~26

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3602/2014

TRISTAR FORMULATIONS PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Chandrika Gupta, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 13.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~27

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6833/2014

TARASPAN SOLUTIONS PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Naveen Dahiya, Ms. Manisha Chaudhary and Mr. Mansumyer Singh, Advocates.

versus

CHIEF CONTROLING REVENUE AUTHORITY & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ramesh Singh, Standing Counsel and Mr. Dhananjaya Mishra, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 22.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~28

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1069/2015

KAMLA & ANR

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Prabhat Kumar, Advocate.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ORS

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sumit Jidani, Advocate for R-1.
Mr. Abhay Kumar and Mr. Saurabh Mishra, Advocates for R-2 & 3.
Ms. Sneha verma, Advocate for Gaurang Kanth, Advocate for MCD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **10.05.2018**

Renotify the matter on 28.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~29

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11617/2015

TWINKLE CHHABRA

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Ritu Negi, Advocate.

versus

STATE BANK OF INDIA AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajiv Kapur, Advocate.s

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 4.12.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~30

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8907/2016

ASHISH DWIVEDI

..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

CENTRAL BOARD OF FILM CERTIFICATION

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Vikram Jetly, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 3.12.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~31

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10822/2016

VVC REALINFRA PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

GAIL INDIA LIMITED

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Purnima Maheshwari, Ms. Sneh suman and Mr. Yuvraj Sharma, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **10.05.2018**

Renotify the matter on 3.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 918/2013

PRAVEEN CHOUDHARY

..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 25.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~36

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7611/2015

NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Manpreet Kaur, Advocate.

versus

ALOK KUMAR GHOSH

..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 4.12.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~37

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

\+ CONT.CAS(C) 569/2016

DEEPAK GOEL

..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

V S MADAN

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Umesh Mishra with Mr. V.S. Madan, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 10.05.2018

Renotify the matter on 3.12.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~38

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5439/2016

M/S VOESTALPINE SCHIENEN GMBH

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Shalini Sati Prasad and Mr. Asees Jasmine Kaur, Advocates.

versus

DELHI METRO RAIL CORPORATION LTD. & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sudhir Nandrajjog, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Tarun Johri and Mr. Ankit Saini, Advocates for DMRC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **10.05.2018**

1. Renotify the matter on 30.11.2018.

2. Interim order will continue to operate, in the meanwhile.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 10, 2018
cks

$~74

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

\+ W.P.(C) No.5213/2018 & C.M. APPL. No.20204/2018

RADHA & ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Anupradha Singh, Advocate.

versus

DELHI URBAN SHELTER IMPROVEMENT BOARD & ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Parvinder Chauhan with Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocate for R-1/DUSIB.
Ms. Puja Kalra, Advocate for R-2 /SDMC.
Ms. Anju Aggarwal, ASG with Ms. Deboshree Mukherjee, Advocate for R-3 & R-4.
Mr. Roshan Lal Goel with Ms. Anju Gupta, Advocates for R-5/UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 14.05.2018

1. Issue notice.

2. Mr. Chauhan accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.1/ DUSIB. Ms. Puja Kalra accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.2/SDMC. Ms. Deboshree Mukherjee accepts notice on behalf of respondent nos.3 and 4. Likewise, Mr. Roshan Lal accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.5/ UOI.

3. In sum, stand of the petitioners before me is that they are residents of JJ Basti, E-Block Re-settlement Colony Khyala, Delhi – 110018. The petitioners are 25 in number living in separate houses. It is the case of the petitioners that their hutments have been part of the aforementioned JJ cluster prior to 1.1.2015 and, therefore, they are entitled to the benefit of Delhi Slum & JJ Rehabilitation and Relocation Policy, 2015 (in short "2015 Policy").

4. Mr. Chauhan, who appears on advance notice submits that apart from above, the petitioners have to satisfy the other condition under the 2015 Policy; which is, that the JJ cluster should have come up before 01.01.2006 a condition which is not fulfilled.

4.1 Besides this, Mr. Chauhan says that the electricity bills appended to the writ petition indicate that the date of energization, is a date, which falls after 01.01.2015.

4.2 Based on these assertions, Mr. Chauhan says that the petition is not tenable.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioners relies upon the Voter Identity Cards of some of the petitioners to demonstrate that they have been living in the concerned JJ clusters prior to 01.01.2015.

5.1 I must, however, note here that no averment seems to have been made that the concerned JJ cluster came up prior to 01.01.2006. This fact was brought to the notice of learned counsel for the petitioners. Learned counsel says that the writ petition was filed hurriedly and, therefore, short accommodation be given to place more material on record. Having said so, it is contended on behalf of the petitioners that no show-cause notice was

issued prior to attempts being made to cause the removal of the petitioners from the subject area.

6. Ms. Puja Kalra, who appears for respondent no.2/ SDMC states that she has obtained instructions to the effect that, presently, no demolition drive taken up by the said respondent. Likewise, Mr. Chauhan says that the respondent no.1/ DUSIB also has no intimation of any demolition drive. Mr. Chauhan, however, says that he has instructions, to the effect, that no JJ cluster exists in E-Block, Re-settlement Colony, Khyala, Delhi.

7. To my mind, matter needs some bit of further examination. In these circumstances, parties are directed to maintain status-quo as to possession till further orders of the Court. Counter affidavits will be filed by the respondents within four weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing. The petitioners will place on record necessary material to satisfy the twin conditions, which are referred to in the 2015 Policy.

8. Apart from anything else the petitioners will file a site plan and a google map of the subject area; copies of which will be furnished to counsel for the respondents. The needful will be done within two weeks from today.

9. Renotify the matter on 20.07.2018.

10. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 14, 2018
hs

$~63

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5230/2018 & C.M Appl. No.20276/2018

C-4 JHUGGI KALYAN SAMITI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Choudhary Ali Zia Kabir and Ms. Y. Asenla Pongen, Advs.

versus

DELHI URBAN SHELTER IMPROVEMENT BOARD AND OTHERS.

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Hetu Arora Sethi, ASC for R-3 & R-4.
Ms. Anju Gupta and Mr. Roshan Lal Goel, Advs for R-5/UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 15.05.2018

1 The petitioner impugns the notice dated 04.04.2018. This notice has been appended at page 50 of the paper book.

2 A perusal of the notice would show that though the name of the authority which issued the notice is not indicated, it does require all the jhuggi dwellers who are residing on the railway land stretching between Adarsh Nagar to Daya Basti to remove themselves. According to the impugned notice, the jhuggi dwellers are encroachers.

3 The petitioner Samiti claims its members have been residing in the subject area, albeit, as encroachers prior to 01.01.2015 and are, therefore, entitled to relocation under the 2015 Policy framed by

DUSIB.

3.1 The petitioner Samiti also avers that its members have not been served with any notice of eviction.

3 Issue notice.

4 Ms. Hetu Arora Sethi accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 3 & 4. Likewise, Ms Anju Gupta accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 5.

5 On steps being taken, notice will issue to respondent Nos.1 & 2.

6 Counter affidavit be filed within four weeks from today.

7 Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

8 The respondents will maintain status quo as to the possession, till the next date of hearing.

9 Renotify the matter on 20.07.2018.

10 Order dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 15, 2018
A

$~76

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4265/2018

MAHDOOM KADAR BACHA NOORUL AMEEN..... Petitioner
Through: Ms. Prachi Johri, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Amit Narayan, CGSC/UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM Appl. 16664/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4265/2018 & CM Appl. 16663/2018

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of company by the name: MG Project Services Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). Furthermore, the petitioner states that he had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant

provisions of law. The petitioner avers that on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~72

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4261/2018

VISHAL SALHOTRA & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Harish Kumar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Ripu Daman Bhardwaj with Mr.Brajesh Kumar, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: V2 Motion Pictures Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners also state that the Company has not been carrying on any business for the past three years and that its bank account has also not been operated for the past three years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~73

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4262/2018

GURMIT SINGH & ANR ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Alok Tripathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Ripu Daman Bhardwaj with
Mr.Brajesh Kumar, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16655/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4262/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: GN Properties Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state the Company has not commenced operations since its inception. Furthermore, the petitioner state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official

respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C)

9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject Company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~74

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4263/2018

ATUL KUMAR SINGH AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Ms.Arunima Dwivedi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Vinod Diwakar, CGSC with
Mr.Sanjay Pal, Adv. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16657/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4263/2018

2. The petitioners filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Ecocapita Technologies Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company did not commence business since its incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that it is on

account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums

will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~75, 94 & 98

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4264/2018

RAGHVI GOSWAMI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shobhan Mahanti, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with Ms.L. Ganguli, Adv. for R1&2.

\+ W.P.(C) 4281/2018

SANYAM SUNEJA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shobhan Mahanti, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with Ms.L. Ganguli, Adv. for R1&2.

\+ W.P.(C) 4285/2018

MADAN MOHAN GROVER ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shobhan Mahanti, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr.Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with Ms.L. Ganguli, Adv. for R1&2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16658/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4264/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the captioned writ petitions, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Breekon Peaks Impex Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of

the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list

of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~57

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4126/2018

OMAIR ALAM AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Shailendra Singh and Ms.Ruchira Garg, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Ms.Bharathi Raju, CGSC for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.16239/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4126/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Ahmad and Alam Impex Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned

infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ

petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

13. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavits filed by the petitioner.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~58

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4128/2018

SHAHLA REHMAN AND ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Shailendra Singh and Ms.Ruchira Garg, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.P.S. Singh, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Saakshi Agrawal, Adv. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.16241/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4128/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Zenith Craft Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 24.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have the Company voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

3.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018 via diary no. 118631.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in

the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

13. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavits filed by the petitioner.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~59

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4129/2018

MOHAN CHANDRA BHATT AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Shailendra Singh and Ms.Ruchira Garg, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.P.S. Singh, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Saakshi Agrawal, Adv. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.16242/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4129/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Classic Album Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver

that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 24.04.2018, wherein at request of the counsel for the petitioner, the matter was renotified for 26.4.2018.

3.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018 via diary no. 118621.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in

the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

13. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavits filed by the petitioner.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
Neelam

$~54

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4118/2018

NITIN VERMA AND ANR. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Shailendra Singh and Ms.Ruchira Garg, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.P.S. Singh, Sr. Adv. and Ms.Saakshi Agrwala, Adv. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.16225/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4118/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Janhavi Softech Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of

law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme.

These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~52

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4083/2018

SANGITA DHINGRA ..... Petitioner

Through: Dr.Rakesh Gosain, Mr.Pankaj Bhardwaj and Mr.Nipun Bhardwaj, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.D.P. Bhardwaj, Adv. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: IS Metal Ford Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 24.04.2018, at request of the counsel for the petitioner, the matter was renotified for 26.4.2018.

2.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018 via diary no. 117998.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme.

These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

9. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

12. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavits filed by the petitioner.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~31

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2178/2018 & CM APP No. 8998/2018

CARETEL INFOTECH LTD. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Sanjeev Sagar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent
Through: Mr.Anurag Ahluwalia, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Learned counsel for the respondent seeks further time to file a counter affidavit. Let needful be done within two weeks from today.

2. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

3. Renotify the matter on 27.08.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~36 to 42

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

\+ **W.P.(C) 156/2018 & CM APP No. 644/2018**

M/S CRYSTAL CROP PROTECTION PVT. LTD..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Gaurav Barathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr.Waize Ali Noor, Adv.

\+ **W.P.(C) 163/2018 & CM APP No. 704/2018**

M/S CRYSTAL CROP PROTECTION PVT. LTD..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Gaurav Barathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr.Waize Ali Noor, Adv.

\+ **W.P.(C) 164/2018 & CM APP No. 706/2018**

M/S CRYSTAL CROP PROTECTION PVT. LTD..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Gaurav Barathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr.Waize Ali Noor, Adv.

\+ **W.P.(C) 165/2018 & CM APP No. 708/2018**

M/S CRYSTAL CROP PROTECTION PVT. LTD..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Gaurav Barathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr.Waize Ali Noor, Adv.

\+ **W.P.(C) 166/2018 & CM APP No. 710/2018**

M/S CRYSTAL CROP PROTECTION PVT. LTD..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Gaurav Barathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr.Waize Ali Noor, Adv.

\+ **W.P.(C) 171/2018 & CM APP No. 719/2018**

M/S CRYSTAL CROP PROTECTION PVT. LTD..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Gaurav Barathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr.Waize Ali Noor, Adv.

\+ **W.P.(C) 176/2018 & CM APP No. 731/2018**

M/S CRYSTAL CROP PROTECTION PVT. LTD..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Gaurav Barathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr.Waize Ali Noor, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Mr. Barathi, who appears for the petitioner, informs me that a final decision has been rendered by the Appellate Authority in Appeal Nos.10, 11 and 13 to 17 of 2017. A copy of the order 24.04.2018, passed by the Appellate Authority, has been shown to me, in Court, today.

2. Given this circumstance, Mr. Barathi, submits that he would like to withdraw the captioned writ petition and move afresh to assail the said order.

3. Liberty in that behalf is granted.

4. Writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty, as prayed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~78

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4267/2018

PANKAJ SINGH AND ANR. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Alok Tripathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Ripu Daman Bhardwaj and Mr.Brajesh Kumar, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.16669/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P. (C) 4267/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Landbase Estate Management Services Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the company has not carried on business since 2013. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
Neelam

$~79

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4268/2018

VINOD PAL AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Sushant Kumar, Ms. Shikha Singh and Mr.Anitesh Sharma, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Ms.Bharathi Raju, CGSC for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No. 16671/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4268/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Evergreen Fashions Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the company has not carried on business since the past 6 years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~80

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4269/2018

VIJAY PRATAP AND ANR. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Rakesh Kumar, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES, DELHI AND ANR.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Manish Mohan, CGSC with
Ms.Manisha Saroha, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16673/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4269/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Boards of companies by the names: Vaag Structures Private Limited and Bulk Bookings Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Companies"). The petitioners state that the companies have not carried on business since the date of their incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Companies' financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the subject companies mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
Neelam

$~81

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4270/2018 & CM APP No. 16674/2018

RAJ KUMAR GUPTA & ORS ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Aditya Nayyar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.B.S. Shukla, CGSC with
Mr.Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16675/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4270/2018

2. At the request of learned counsel for the petitioners, renotify the matter on 27.04.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~82

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4271/2018

MR. VIPIN CHADHA AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.P.K.Mittal, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Manish Mohan, CGSC with
Ms.Manisha Saroha, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16677/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4271/2018 & CM APP No.16678/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Manish Mohan, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of official respondents.

3. Counsels are agreed that the issue raised in the present writ petition is covered by the order dated 20.04.2018 passed in various writ petitions including W.P.(C) No.3887/2018, titled: *Prabuddha Choudhury vs. Registrar of Companies and Anr.* In sum, the petitioners seek to revive the subject company i.e., RJ Developers Private Limited, by filing an appeal, if not already filed, before the NCLT under Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013.

4. Counsel for the petitioners says that qua the subject company, he seeks application of the directives contained in the aforementioned order,

insofar as it concerns the petitioners.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the official respondents to apply the directives contained in *Prabuddha Choudhury* (Supra).

6. It is made clear that the directions contained in aforementioned order will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioner(s) herein.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

7. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~83

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4272/2018 & CM APP No. 16678/2018

MUKESH AGGARWAL AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Ms.Isha Bhalla, Adv. for P1&2.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.D.P. Bhardwaj, CGSC for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16678/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4272/2018 & CM APP No.16679/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Thomson Exim Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company has not carried on business since the last few years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~84

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4273/2018

ROHIT KHAITAN AND ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Ashish Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Saakshi Agrawal, Adv. for R1&2. Ms.Anju Gupta, Ms.Asha Aggarwal and Mr.R.C. Goel, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM Appl. 16681/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4273/2018 & CM Appl. 16680/2018

2. Counsels are agreed that the issue raised in the present writ petition is covered by the order dated 26.04.2018 passed in various writ petitions including W.P.(C) No.4190/2018, titled: *Vijay Arora vs. Union of India*. In sum, the petitioners seek to avail of the benefits of Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018.

2.1 Counsel for the petitioners says that qua the subject company i.e., Bharat Logitrans Private Limited, they seek application of directives contained in the aforementioned order.

3. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the

official respondents to apply the directives contained in *Vijay Arora* (Supra).

4. It is made clear that the directions contained in aforementioned order will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioner(s) herein.

5. It is further made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the one(s) mentioned in the caption writ petition, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

9. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 27, 2018/ak

$~112

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4224/2018

HEMANT SHARMA AND ORS.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ketan Madan, Mr. Himanshu Harbola

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

W.P.(C) No.4224/2018 & CM Appl.16553/2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. The petitioners claims that they was appointed as Directors on the Board of a company by the name: Kamaksha Renewable Power Project Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that no business activity has been carried out and no bank account has been operated since incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioners states that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners avers that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ

petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

9. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/mk

$~115

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4238/2018 & CM APP Nos.16590-91/2018

SURINDER SINGH ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Nikhil Kumar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.16590/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4238/2018 & CM APP No.16591/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, accepts notice on behalf of official respondents.

3. Counsels are agreed that the issue raised in the present writ petition is covered by the order dated 20.04.2018 passed in various writ petitions including W.P.(C) No.3887/2018, titled: *Prabuddha Choudhury. Vs Registrar of Companies and Anr.* In sum, the petitioner seeks to revive the subject companies by filing an appeal, if not already filed, before the NCLT under Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013.

4. Counsel for the petitioner says that qua the subject companies i.e.,

i. Dynamic Finvest Services Private Limited

ii. Kala Realtech Private Limited

iii. Akshaj Properties Private Limited

iv. Akshaj Estates Private Limited

v. Akshaj Builders Private Limited

he seeks application of the directives contained in the aforementioned order, insofar as it concerns the petitioner.

4.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 25.04.2018, wherein at request of the counsel for the petitioners, the matter was renotified for 26.4.2018.

4.2 It is in this background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 26.04.2018

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the official respondents to apply the directives contained in *Prabuddha Choudhury* (Supra).

6. It is made clear that the directions contained in aforementioned order will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioner(s) herein.

7. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the ones mentioned in paragraph 4 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

9. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/mk

$~113

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4225/2018 & CM APP No.16555/2018

WON JUN KIM AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through : Ms. Arunima Dwivedi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: JMP Import Export Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official

respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated

21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

9. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 2 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~110

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4194/2018 & CM APP No.16477/2018

MANOJ KUMAR SHARMA AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Ketan Madan, Mr. Himanshu Harbola and Mr. Satvik Bajaj, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Ujjwal Hydro Power Project Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official

respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated

21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~109

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4193/2018 & CM APP No.16474/2018

RAAKHI SHARMA AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Ketan Madan, Mr. Himanshu Harbola and Mr. Satvik Bajaj, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The record shows that there are two petitioners and essentially two companies qua which relief is sought in the matter. Petitioners, it appears were appointed as Directors on the Board of Companies by the names:

i. Kamaksha Hydro Power Private Limited (in short "KHPL"), and,

ii. Dron Hydro Power Private Limited (in short "DHPL")

It is also the case of the petitioner that since financial statements and statutory returns were not filed *vis-a-vis* KHPL and DHPL their names were struck off from the register of companies. Resultantly, the names of the petitioners were included in the list of disqualified Directors for financial year 2014-16.

2. In so far as DHPL is concerned counsels are agreed that the issue raised in the present writ petition is covered by the order dated 20.04.2018 passed in various writ petitions including W.P.(C) No.3887/2018, titled:

Prabuddha Choudhury. Vs Registrar of Companies and Anr. In sum, the petitioner seeks to revive DHPL by filing an appeal, if not already filed, before the NCLT under Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013.

3. Counsel for the petitioner says that qua the subject company i.e., DHPL he seeks application of the directives contained in the aforementioned order, insofar as it concerns the petitioner.

3.1. Accordingly, the directions are given to the official respondents to apply the directives contained in *Prabuddha Choudhury* (Supra).

3.2. It is made clear that the directions contained in aforementioned order will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioner(s) herein.

4. In so far as KHPL is concerned, the petitioners, in line with orders passed by this Court, is disposed of in terms of the following directions:-

KHPL

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the

Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

DHPL

i. As an when the NCLT passes an order of revival, the petitioners will have liberty to avail off the benefits of Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018.

5. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 1 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

6. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~114

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4226/2018 & CM APP No.16557/2018

RAMESH GUPTA ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Avadh Kaushik, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Manish Mohan and Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSCs with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The petitioner have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

2. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of companies namely:-

i. Crystal Restaurant and Banquet Private Limited (in short "CRBPL"), and,

ii. Hallmark Media Private Limited (in short "HMPL")

(hereinafter referred to as "Companies"). The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the Companies have not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioner states that he had not filed the Companys' financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law

that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 25.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have the Companies voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

2.2 It is in this background that petitioners have filed affidavit dated 26.04.2018 via diary no. 119811.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary

striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

9. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 2 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~105

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4167/2018 & CM APP No.16358/2018

MANOJ KUMAR ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Avadh Kaushik, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Manish Mohan, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The petitioner have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

2. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of companies namely:-

iii. Crystal Restaurant and Banquet Private Limited (in short "CRBPL"), and,

iv. Hallmark Media Private Limited (in short "HMPL")

(hereinafter referred to as "Companies"). The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the Companies have not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioner states that he had not filed the Companys' financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 25.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have the Companies voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

2.2 It is in this background that petitioners have filed affidavit dated 26.04.2018 via diary no. 119810.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in

the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

9. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 2 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~104

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4017/2018 & CM APP Nos.15844-45/2018

WON JUN KIM AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through : Ms. Arunima Dwivedi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kanishk Arora, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.15845/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4017/2018 & CM APP No.15844/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 25.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have JW Studio Private Limited voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

2.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: JW Studio Private Limited (hereinafter

referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter “Scheme”). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary

striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~103

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3956/2018 & CM APP No.15621/2018

JEETU SINGH ..... Petitioner
Through : Ms. Amrita Mishra, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with
Mr. Ruchir Ranjan Rai and
Mr. Siddharth Singh, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

1. Issue notice. Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, accepts notice on behalf of official respondents.

2. Counsels are agreed that the issue raised in the present writ petition is covered by the order dated 20.04.2018 passed in various writ petitions including W.P.(C) No.3887/2018, titled: *Prabuddha Choudhury. Vs Registrar of Companies and Anr.* In sum, the petitioner seeks to revive the subject company by filing an appeal, if not already filed, before the NCLT under Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013.

3. Counsel for the petitioner says that qua the subject company i.e., Bright Foods and Chemicals Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"), he seeks application of the directives contained in the aforementioned order, insofar as it concerns the petitioner.

3.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 20.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to obtain instructions in the matter as to the compliances made to revive the Company, further which the matter was listed on 25.4.2018. On 25.4.2018, at request of the counsel for the petitioner, the matter was renotified for 26.4.2018.

3.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018

4. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the official respondents to apply the directives contained in *Prabuddha Choudhury* (Supra).

5. It is made clear that the directions contained in aforementioned order will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioner(s) herein.

6. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

8. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~102

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3919/2018 & CM APP No.15512/2018

KARAN SHARMA ..... Petitioner
Through : Ms. Amrita Mishra, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with
Mr. Ruchir Ranjan Rai and
Mr. Siddharth Singh, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Issue notice. Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, accepts notice on behalf of official respondents.

2. Counsels are agreed that the issue raised in the present writ petition is covered by the order dated 20.04.2018 passed in various writ petitions including W.P.(C) No.3887/2018, titled: *Prabuddha Choudhury. Vs Registrar of Companies and Anr.* In sum, the petitioner seeks to revive the subject company by filing an appeal, if not already filed, before the NCLT under Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013.

3. Counsel for the petitioner says that qua the subject company i.e., Bright Foods and Chemicals Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"), he seeks application of the directives contained in the aforementioned order, insofar as it concerns the petitioner.

3.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 20.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to obtain instructions in the matter as to the compliances made to revive the Company, further which the matter was listed on 25.4.2018. On 25.4.2018, at request of the counsel for the petitioner, the matter was renotified for 26.4.2018.

3.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018

4. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the official respondents to apply the directives contained in *Prabuddha Choudhury* (Supra).

5. It is made clear that the directions contained in aforementioned order will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioner(s) herein.

6. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

8. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~71

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4260/2018 & CM APP Nos.16651-52/2018

ASHOK KUMAR MISHRA AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Rajiv Shankar Dvivedi and
Mr. Shushant K. Sarkar, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Gaurang Kanth, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No.16651/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4260/2018 & CM APP No.16652/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Know Design India Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3.1 A perusal of the master data of the Company shows that there are 3 Directors on the Board of the Company, whereas, the learned counsel for the petitioner informs that the third Director, Mr. Olivier Pierre Luc Vecchierini has resigned from the Board of the Company.

3.2 It is in this background that petitioners have filed affidavit dated 26.04.2018.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in

the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~101

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3913/2018 & CM APP No.15434/2018

SHEEL RATAN ..... Petitioner
Through : Ms. Amrita Mishra, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Ms. Shiva Lakshmi, CGSC with
Mr. Ruchir Ranjan Rai and
Mr. Siddharth Singh, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The petitioner have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. The petitioner claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Good Morning Buildwell Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioner state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 25.04.2018, wherein

the counsel for the petitioner sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have Company voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

2.2 It is in the background that petitioner have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018 via diary no. 118911.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on

or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

9. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 2 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~99

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4286/2018 & CM APP Nos.16706-07/2018

MALAYA RANJAN BEHERA AND ORS ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. S.P. Singh Chawla, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.16707/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4286/2018 & CM APP No.16706/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Anuna Herbals Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver

that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme.

These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~96

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4283/2018 & CM Nos.16702-03/2018

SH. VED PARKASH YADAV AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Ajay Singh, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. .... Respondents
Through : Mr. Manish Mohan, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.16703/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4283/2018 & CM No.16702/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Boards of companies by the name: Aravalli Properties Limited, Rishi Properties Limited & Chiranji Properties Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Companies").

4. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

5. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

6. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

7. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~93

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4280/2018 & CM APP Nos.16698-99/2018

ANUPAM ATTRI AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. S.P. Singh Chawla, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Bhagvan Swarup Shukla, CGSC with Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.16699/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4280/2018 & CM APP No.16698/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Ishu Constructions Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of

law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme.

These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~92

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4279/2018 & CM APP Nos.16695-96/2018

SHEKHAR KEJRIWAL AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Prashant Kumar and
Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Gaurang Kanth, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No.16695/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4279/2018 & CM APP No.16696/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Mahadevi Rugs Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "Company").

4. Furthermore, the petitioners state that the company has not started business since its incorporation and has not filed the financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be

included in the impugned list.

5. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

6. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

7. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~89

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4043/2018

OBAID AHMAD AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Shailendra Singh and Ms. Rachita Garg, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. P.S. Singh, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Saakshi Agrawal, Adv. for R-1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: SHO Designers Collection Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The company has not carried out any business for the past 3 years and its bank account is also not in operation for the past 3 years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those

issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

9. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~88

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4277/2018 & CM APP Nos.16689-90/2018

NITENDRA TIWARI AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Ketan Madan and Mr. Pankaj Khullar, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with Mr. Ms. L. Gangmei, Adv. for R-1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.16690/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4277/2018 & CM APP No.16689/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: M.H.Engineering Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the company was incorporated in 2008 and to date no transaction has taken place in the company.

Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~87

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4276/2018 & CM APP Nos.16687-88/2018

SRIVALLABHA VENKATA VISWANATHAM SRIPADA AND ANR. ..... Petitioners

Through : Mr. Sourav Roy, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC with
Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Shahi and
Mr. Harsh Pandit, Advs. for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.16688/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4276/2018 & CM APP No.16687/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Shree Giri Television Networks Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The company has been inoperative since its incorporation and no transaction or business has been carried out since 2006.

Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~85

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4274/2018 & CM APP Nos.16682-84/2018

YUVRAJ SINGH & ORS ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Alok Tripathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj and
Mr. Brajesh Kumar, Advs. for R-1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No.16683/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4274/2018 & CM APP No.16682/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Townscape Infraprojects Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the company has not commenced any form of business activity since 2013 and no transaction was made thereafter. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions

of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018

$~111

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4220/2018

SHAILENDRA KUMAR ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Ravi Prakash and Mr. Sandeep Malik, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Sanjay Kumar and Mr. Gaurav Rohilla, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

At request of counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 27.4.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~95

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4282/2018 & CM APP No.16701/2018

VANDANA TATER ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Shobhan Mahanti, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with
Ms. L. Gangmei, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.16701/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4282/2018

2. At request of counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 27.4.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~97

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4284/2018 & CM APP No.16704/2018

ALOK SINGH TATER ..... Petitioner
Through : Mr. Shobhan Mahanti, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through : Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with
Ms. L. Gangmei, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.16704/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4284/2018

At request of counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 27.4.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~19 & 20

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

+ W.P.(C) 3902/2017 & CM APP Nos.17174/2017, 17909/2017 & 26471/2017

RAM BRIKSH PRASAD & ORS .... Petitioners

Through : Mr. Yatendra Sharma, Adv.

versus

NCT DELHI THROUGH ITS SECRETARY & ORS ..... Respondents

Through : Ms. Jyoti Taneja and Ms. Shruti Munjal, Advs.

+ W.P.(C) 4313/2017 & CM APP No.18786/2017

KALI CHARAN ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Yatendra Sharma, Adv.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Devesh Singh, ASC (Civil) with Ms. Sukriti Ghai, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

At joint request of the parties, renotify the matters on 26.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~3

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3471/2018 & CM APP No.13690/2018

M/S AMBICA TRADEXPO PRIVATE LTD. THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR- VIKAS VASUDEVA ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Rishi Manchanda, Adv.

versus

M/S KOTAK MAHINDRA PRIME LTD. ..... Respondent

Through : Mr. Vishal Rao, Adv,

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Counsel for the petitioner says that a settlement has been reached with the respondent. However, report of the mediator does not appear to be on record.

2. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 12.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018

$~66

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4253/2018 & CM APP No.16627/2018

M/S BALAJI UDYOG AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through : Mr. Vivek Gupta, Adv.

versus

CENTRAL GROUND WATER AUTHORITY (CGWA) AND ANR ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. T.P. Singh, Adv. for R-1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.16627/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4253/2018

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, after some arguments seeks leave to withdraw the captioned writ petition with liberty to approach the appropriate forum.

3. As prayed, the writ petition is dismissed as withdraw with liberty as sought for above.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
mk

$~117

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4342/2018

PEEYUSH DAYAL & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Pandey with Mr. Manmohan, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Advocate for R-1 and 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. At request of counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 27.4.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
p

$~116

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4340/2018

TARUN GOYAL AND ORS. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sarvik Singhai, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, Advocate for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

C.M. No.16848/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4340/2018 & C.M. No.16847/2018

2. In this matter, I am informed by the learned ASG that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

3. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

4. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.04.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

5. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

6. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

7. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

8. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject Company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary

consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
p

$~100

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4288/2018

AJAY KUMAR VERMA AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Kanishk Arora, Advocate for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Renotify the matter on 27.4.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
P

$~43

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4327/2014

SARWAN KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Manish Mohan, CGSC with Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, GP and Mr. Manish Saroha, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

1. Mr. Manish, learned counsel for the respondents submits that he will have the matter examined in the light of the judgment dated 16.9.2010 passed by a Single Judge of this Court, in W.P.(C) No.10185/2009, titled: *Shyam Lal vs. Union of India and Ors*.

2. As a matter of fact, this was put to the respondents as far back as on 16.7.2014.

3. Renotify the matter on 17.8.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
p

$~44

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4721/2011

FRICK INDIA LTD ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Shobha with Ms. Satyani Saikia, Advocates.

versus

UOI AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra with Mr. Mukesh Tiwari and Mr. Abhishek Rana, Advocates for R-1 & 2.
Mr. S.K. Dhingra with Ms. Shefali Mitra, Advocates for R-3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Counsel for respondent nos.1 and 2 says that he will file his written submissions. Let the needful be done within 4 weeks from today.

2. To be noted, the petitioner and respondent no.3 have already filed their written submissions.

3. Accordingly renotify the matter on 26.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
p

$~45

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6813/2016

INDRAPRASTHA GAS LIMITED ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saurav Agrawal with Mr. Hitabhilash Mohanty, Advocates.

versus

MICRO AND SMALL ENTTERPRISES FACILITATION COUNCIL & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Paul, advocate along with Gagan Parashar, MD of R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

1. No time left.
2. It is already 6.00 PM.
3. Renotify the matter on 28.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
p

$~33-35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 610/2013

SH. PURAN MULTIMEDIA LTD ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. K. Datta with Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC with Mr. Rajesh Kumar and Mr. Siddharth Rathore, Advocates for UOI.
Mr. Neel Mason with Ms. Ridhima Pabbi, Advocates for R-3.

34

\+ W.P.(C) 5312/2013

DHAMAAL 24 RADIO NETWORK LIMITED ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Utkarsh Chanana with Ms. Rupsha Banerjee, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar with Mr. Siddharth Rathore, Advocates for UOI.
Mr. Pragyan Pradip Sharma with Ms. Anandini Kumari, Advocates for R-2.
Mr. Neeraj Kr. Gupta with Mr. Ranjeet Kr. Singh, Advocates for R-3.

35

\+ W.P.(C) 9323/2015

HT MUSIC AND ENTERTAINMENT CO. LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Utkarsh Chanana with Ms.

Rupsha Banerjee, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narula, CGSC with Ms. Anumita Chandra, Advocate for UOI.
Mr. Pragyan Pradip Sharma with Ms. Anandini Kumari, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. At request of learned counsel for the parties, renotify the matters on 20.08.2018.

2. In the meanwhile, Mr. Narula will revert with instructions with regard to the appointment of members of the IPAB, as presently, the power to decide the issues raised in the captioned matter is vested in that authority. For this purpose, reliance is placed on section 11 of the Copyright Act, 1957 as amended by Finance Act, 2017 w.e.f. 26.05.2017.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
p

$~32

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2743/2018

NATIONAL COOPERATIVE UNION OF INDIA ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Anju Bhattacharya with Mr. Omprakash, Mr. Rajeev , Mr.Pradeep Kr. Tripathi, Mr. Abhimanyu and Mr. Ankit Panwar.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Narula, CGSC with Ms. Anumita Chandra, Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Ms. Bhattacharya, learned counsel for the petitioner, states that she received a copy of the counter affidavit, only, yesterday and, therefore, would require time to file a rejoinder in the matter. Let the needful be done within 3 weeks from today.

2. The request is acceded to.

3. Renotify the matter on 25.7. 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
p

$~46

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3740/2018

SURENDER KUMAR SHARMA ..... Petitioner
Through: Ms. Prachi Johri, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Sanjay Kumar with Ms. Kalpana Devi, Advs. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM Appl. 14796/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.3740/2018 & CM Appl. 14795/2018

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 17.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioner sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the whether the persons, who are not petitioners before this Court, but are Directors on the Board of the company referred to hereafter, would want to join the petition.

2.2 It is in this background that petitioner has filed a copy of trail mails exchanged between him and the other Directors dated 24.04.2018.

3. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of

company by the name: Adrett Homes Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "ADL"). Furthermore, the petitioner states that he had not filed the ADL's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~47

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3975/2018

MUKUL NIRWAN ..... Petitioner
Through: Ms. Prachi Johri, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.B.S. Shukla, CGSC with
Mr.Kamaldeep, Adv. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM Appl. 15697/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.3975/2018 & CM Appl. 14696/2018

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioner.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 23.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioner sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the whether the persons, who are not petitioners before this Court, but are Directors on the Board of the company referred to hereafter, would want to join the petition. However, the affidavit dated 24.04.2018, filed by petitioner, state that the Directors other than the petitioner, do not have any objection with regard to the reliefs sought by the petitioner herein.

3. Issue notice. Mr. B.S. Shukla, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

4. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of company by the name: Adrett Homes Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "ADL"). Furthermore, the petitioner states that he had not filed the ADL's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

5. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

6. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

7. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

8. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

12. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavit that has been filed by the petitioner.

13. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~48

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4033/2018

KIRTI JAIN ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Gaurav Varma, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent

Through: Ms.Shiva Lakshmi, Mr.Siddharth Singh and Mr.Ruchir Ranjan Rai, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM Appl. 15945/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4033/2018 & CM Appl. 15944/2018

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioner.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 23.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioner sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the whether the persons, who are not petitioners before this Court, but are Directors on the Boards of the company referred to hereafter, would want to join the petition. However, the affidavit dated 23.04.2018, filed by petitioner, states that the Director other than the petitioner, does not have any objection with regard to the reliefs sought by the petitioner herein.

3. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of company by the name: Jainam Petro Chem Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "JPCP"). Furthermore, the petitioner states that JPCP has carried out no business since its inception and hence no financial statements and statutory returns have been filed since 2006-2007, as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter “Scheme”). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of

Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~49

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4034/2018

MRS. VEENA DEVI AND ANR ..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Kanishk Aggarwal, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through Mr. Ajay Digpaul, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.15949/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4034/2018 & CM. APPL. No.15948/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: VA Edutech Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company has not carried on any business for the past three years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official

respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~50

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4068/2018

JOGINDER SINGH ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Shobhan Mahanti, Adv.
versus
UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Gaurang Kanth, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.16022/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4068/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Peregrine Protection Services Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 24.04.2018, wherein

the counsel for the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have the Company voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

3.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018 via diary no. 119000.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on

or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

13. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavits filed by the petitioner.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~55

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4123/2018

ZARINA ALAM AND ANR. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Shailendra Singh and Ms.Ruchira Garg, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Bharathi Raju, CGSC for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.16234/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4123/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Vega Creative Infosoft Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 24.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have the Company voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

3.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018 via diary no. 118633.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in

the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

13. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavits filed by the petitioner.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~56

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4125/2018

ZENAB ALAM AND ORS. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Shailendra Singh and Ms.Ruchira Garg, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.P.S. Singh, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Saakshi Agrawal, Adv. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.16238/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4125/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Zenab Fashions Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the Company has not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 24.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have the Company voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

3.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 25.04.2018 via diary no. 118624.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in

the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

13. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavits filed by the petitioner.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
Neelam

$~60

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1560/2018

ANIL MALHOTRA AND ANR. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Ajay Garg and Mr.Kartikeya Goel, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Kirtiman Singh, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.6402/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 1560/2018

2. The petitioners filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 18.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have Optimum Medical Devices Private Limited voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

2.2 It is in the background that petitioners have filed affidavits dated 21.04.2018.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of

company by the name: Optimum Medical Devices Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company has not been carrying on any business since the past four years. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter “Scheme”). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of

Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/neelam

$~61

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

CM APP No.16634/2018 in
\+ W.P.(C) 2127/2018

DELHI FLYING CLUB ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Raghavendra M. Bajaj and Mr. Shreyas Mehrotra, Advs. along with Mr. A.K. Mohanty, Officiating Secretary.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Digvijay Rai, Adv. with Mr. S. Dayal, GM (Law), Mr. Puneet Gupta, Airport Director and Mr. R.K. Khangwal, JSM (Law), AAI/R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM APP No.16634/2018

1. Mr. Rai says that he needs extension of time till 27.4.2018 for de-sealing the subject premises as he is in the process of filing an appeal. Mr. Bajaj says that he does not have any objection to the extension sought. The said statement is taken on record.

1.2 Paragraph 4.6(vi) will stand altered accordingly.

2. Consequently, the application is disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018

$~63

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4247/2018 & CM No.16614/2018

SANJAY KUMAR SHARMA AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Mohit Gupta and Mr.Rahul Rajpal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Amit Mahajan, CGSC/UOI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No. 16615/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4247/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: GSM Marketing Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company has not been carrying on any business. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those

issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated

21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/neelam

$~64

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4250/2018

AJAY SINHJI JADEJA AND ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.S.P. Singh Chawla, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.B.S. Shukla, CGSC with
Mr.Kamaldeep, Adv.for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16622/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4250/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Jadeja Consultants Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company has not carried on any business since 2005. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~65

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4251/2018

ARVINDER SINGH AND ORS. .... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Alok Tripathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 156625/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4251/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Evident Infrastructure Development Investment Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company has not carried on business since 2007. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official

respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject Company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~67

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4254/2018

SATANAM SINGH & ORS ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Alok Tripathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

2. Issue notice. Mr. Ripu Daman, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: Ram Ghanshayam Developers Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company has not commenced operations since 2009. Furthermore, the petitioners states that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those

issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C)

9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~68

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4257/2018

SATBEER SINGH AND ORS. ..... Petitioners
Through: Mr.Alok Tripathi, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Ripu Daman Bhardwaj with
Mr.Brajesh Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16646/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4257/2018

2. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the names of the petitioners.

3. The petitioners claim that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of company by the name: HKS Developers Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioners state that the Company has not carried on any business since 2009. Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioners aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that their names came to be included in the impugned list.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~69

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4258/2018 & CM APP No. 16647/2018

SHIWANI SINGH & ARN ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.S.P. Singh Chawla, Adv.

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondent
Through: Mr.B.S. Shukla, CGSC with Mr.Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APP No. 16648/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4258/2018

2. At the request of learned counsel for the petitioner, renotify the matter on 27.04.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~70

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4259/2018

VIPIN AGARWAL ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Pramod Kumar Singh, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Amit Mahajan, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

2. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as Director on the Board of company by the name: Rime Medicals Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioner states that the Company has not carried on any business. Furthermore, the petitioner states that he had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner is agreed that the interim directions passed by

this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
neelam

$~4

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3952/2018

FAHAD MOTI KHAN & ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rahul Malhotra with
Ms. Snigdha, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, CGSC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM No.15618/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 3952/2018 & C.M. No. 15617

2. Issue notice. Mr. Rakesh Kumar, CGSC accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

3. Counsels are agreed that the issue raised in the present writ petition is covered by the order dated 20.04.2018 passed in various writ petitions including W.P.(C) No.3887/2018, titled: *Prabuddha Choudhury vs. Registrar of Companies and Anr.* In sum, the petitioners seek to revive the subject company i.e., T9L Technologies Private Limited, by filing an appeal, if not already filed, before the NCLT under Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013.

3.1. It is in this background that an affidavit dated 23.4.2018 has been filed in accordance with dated 20.4.2018 vide Diary no. 115894/2018.

4. Counsel for the petitioners says that qua the subject company, he seeks application of the directives contained in the aforementioned order, insofar as it concerns the petitioners.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the official respondents to apply the directives contained in *Prabuddha Choudhury* (Supra).

6. It is made clear that the directions contained in aforementioned order will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioner(s) herein.

10. It is made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

7. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~108

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4190/2018 & CM APP No.16465/2018

VIJAY ARORA ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Fanish Kumar Raj with
Mr. Abinash Kumar &
Mr. S.K.Roy, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through : Mrs. Bharathi Raju, CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

W.P.(C) 4190/2018 & CM No. 16465/2018

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

2. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of a company by the name: Power Plead Legalities Pvt. Ltd (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the Company has not carried out any business since its incorporation. Furthermore, the petitioner states that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 25.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioner sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on

record as to whether the person, who is not the petitioner before this Court but is a Director on the Board of the Company referred to hereafter, would want to join the petition. However, the affidavit dated 26.04.2018 filed by the petitioner states that the Director other than the Petitioner does not have any objection with regard to the reliefs sought by the petitioner herein.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in

the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

9. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

11. The Registry will scan and upload the affidavit filed by the petitioner.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~107

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4188/2018

VIKRAM KAPOOR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravi Mohan, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES, DELHI AND ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. P.S.Singh, Sr. Adv. with Dr. R.K.Singh, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

W.P.(C) No.4188/2018 & CM Appl.16462/2018

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

1.1. To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 25.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioner sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the whether the persons, who are not petitioners before this Court, but are Directors on the Boards of the company referred to hereafter, would want to join the petition. However, the affidavit dated 26.04.2018, filed by petitioner, states that the Directors other than the petitioner, do not have any objection with regard to the reliefs sought by the petitioner herein.

2. The petitioner claim that he was appointed as a Director on the Boards of the companies by the name: Himalayan Ultimate Adventures Private Limited and Grey Fox Intelligence and Security Services Private Limited. (hereinafter referred to as "Companies").

The petitioner states that the said companies remained inoperative since incorporation and bank accounts have not been opened.

Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 3 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~106

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4172/2018 & CM APP Nos.16379-80/2018

VIPIN AGGARWAL ..... Petitioner:
Through: Mr. Sushant Kumar with Mr. Shikhar Singh &
Mr. Amitesh Sharma, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Vinod Diwakar, CGSC with
Mr. Sanjay Pal, R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM Appl.16380/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4172/2018 & CM Appl.16379/2018

2. Counsels are agreed that the issue raised in the present writ petition is covered by the order dated 26.04.2018 passed in various writ petitions including W.P.(C) No.4190/2018, titled: *Vijay Arora vs. Union of India & Anr.* In sum, the petitioners seek to avail of the benefits of Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018.

3. To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 25.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioner sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the whether the persons, who are not petitioners before this Court, but are Directors on the Board of the subject company referred to hereafter, would want to join the petition.

3.1 It is in this background that the petitioner has filed 2 affidavits and a copy of the consent email dated 26.04.2018.

4. Counsel for the petitioner says that qua the subject company i.e., AMB Talent Media Private Limited, he seeks application of directives contained in the aforementioned order.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the official respondents to apply the directives contained in *Vijay Arora* (Supra).

6. It is made clear that the directions contained in aforementioned order will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioner(s) herein.

7. It is further made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the one(s) mentioned in the caption writ petition, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioner's name in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

8. The Registry is directed to scan and upload the documents furnished by the counsel for the petitioner before this Court today.

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

10. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~90

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4070/2018

MADHUR SOOD AND ANR. ..... Petitioners

Through : Mr. Kunal Sabharwal, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. .... Respondents

Through : Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM. APPL. No.16675/2018

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 4070/2018 & 16674/2018

1. In this matter, I am informed by counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

2. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

3. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of

Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 20.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

4. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

5. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

8. It is made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the ones mentioned in the captioned writ petition, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

10. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/ak

$~77

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4266/2018

POOJA SAWHNEY ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth Tewari, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM Appl.16666/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4266/2018 & CM Appl.16665/2018

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

3. The petitioner claims that she was appointed as a Director on the Board of a company by the name: Aggressive Engineering Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). The petitioner states that since last four years no business activity has taken place and since then the bank accounts of the company are not operational.

Furthermore, the petitioner states that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that her name came to be included in the impugned list.

4. To be noted, the petitioner has obtained the consent of persons

who are not petitioners before this court but are Directors on the Board of the subject company.

4.1 It is in this background that the petitioner has filed affidavit dated 26.04.2018.

5. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

6. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

7. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

8. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

9. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

10. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

11. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the subject company mentioned above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then,

this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

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

13. The Registry is directed to scan and upload the copy of the affidavit furnished by the counsel for the petitioner in Court today.

14. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~53

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4094/2018

VINOD KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth Sharma, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.D.P. Bhardwaj with
Mr. Kanishk Arora, Advs. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM Appl.16122/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4094/2018 & CM Appl.16121/2018

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the official respondents to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

2.1. To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 24.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioner sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the whether the persons, who are not petitioners before this Court, but are Directors on the Boards of the company referred to hereafter, would want to join the petition. However, the application no. 16808 dated 26.04.2018, filed by petitioner, states that the Directors other than the petitioner, do not have any objection with regard to the reliefs sought by the petitioner herein

3. The petitioner claim that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of company by the name: NRV Power Technology India Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "Company"). Furthermore, the petitioners state that they had not filed the Company's financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner aver that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

4. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondents that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

5. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

6. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

(i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.

(ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.

(iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.

(iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

7. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

8. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondents to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

9. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondents presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

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

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~51

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4080/2018

HARMINDER SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shailendra Singh with
Ms. Rachita Garg, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.D.P. Bhardwaj with
Mr. Kanishk Arora, Advs. for R1&2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM Appl.16054/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4080/2018

2. Counsels are agreed that the issue raised in the present writ petition is covered by the order dated 26.04.2018 passed in various writ petitions including W.P.(C) No.4190/2018, titled: *Vijay Arora vs. Union of India*. In sum, the petitioners seek to avail of the benefits of Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018.

3. Counsel for the petitioner says that qua the subject company i.e., Parish Caterers Private Limited, he seeks application of directives contained in the aforementioned order.

4. It is made clear that if there is any other company, apart from the one(s) mentioned in the caption writ petition, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this

order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the official respondents to apply the directives contained in *Vijay Arora* (Supra)

6. It is made clear that the directions contained in aforementioned order will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the petitioner(s) herein.

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

8. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/ak

$~9

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2417/2015, CM. APPL.No.4348/2015

P.K. PANDEY ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sandhya, Proxy counsel for Mr. K.V.Balakrishnan, Adv.

versus

CHIEF INFORMATION COMMISSIONER AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of the counsel for the petitioners i.e. Mr. K.V.Balakrishnan on the ground that he has suddenly taken ill. There is no representation on behalf of the respondents.

2. Renotify on 27th November, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~8

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8594/2014, CM. APPL. No.19830/2014

PRERNA JAIN ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth Joshi, Adv.

versus

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Ralli with
Ms. Harsha Satyakam, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Mr. Sanjeev Ralli, learned counsel who appears for respondent no.2 states that he will furnish a copy of the affidavit dated 23rd November, 2017 to the counsel for the petitioner within one week from today.

2. In case the petitioner wishes to file a rejoinder, the same shall be filed within two weeks of receipt of the copy of the affidavit.

3. Renotify on 5th October, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~7

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4947/2012

GANGA DUTT BHARDWAJ AND ANR ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajender Kumar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Sumit Rana, Adv. for DSIIDC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners is granted last opportunity to file a rejoinder in the matter.

2. Let the needful be done within four weeks.

3. Renotify the matter on 15th October, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~6

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2844/2012, CM. APPL.No.6148/2012

THE JAMMU AND KASHMIR BANK LTD AND ANR

..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Anushruti, Proxy counsel for Mr. G.M.Kawoosa, Adv.

versus

HEMENDER SINGH NEGI ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Asha Jain Madan, Adv. for R-6.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of the counsel for the petitioners i.e. Mr.G.M.Kawoosa on the ground that he has taken ill.

2. Renotify on 19th November, 2018

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~5

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1523/2018

PRASAR THROUGH ITS AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Asutosh Lohia with
Ms. Pragya Srivastava, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anil Soni, CGSC with
Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Abhinav Mukerji with
Mr. Siddharth Garg, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM Appl.6225/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.1523/2018 & CM Appl.6224/2018

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he has just been served with a copy of the reply filed by counsel for respondent no.2/BCCI. According to counsel for respondent no.2/BCCI, the writ petition has been rendered infructuous as the subject tournament has already been conducted.

3. Counsel for the petitioner, however, insists on continuing with the petition. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 26.11.2018.

4. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within four weeks from today.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/ak

$~2

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2966/2018

RESIDENT WELFARE ASSOCIATION, POLICE COLONY, ANDREWS GANJ, NEW DELHI ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saket Sikri, Mr. Ajaypal Singh & Mr. Gurpratap Singh, Advs.

versus

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ramesh Singh with, Mr Chirayu Jain & Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Advs. for R-1 to 3.
Mr. Ashim Sood, CGSC with
Mr. Rhythm B. Adv. for R-4.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

1. Mr.Ramesh Singh, learned counsel for respondent nos. 1 to 3, has placed an affidavit on record wherein *inter alia* it has been indicated that after the construction of new government quarters takes place, the petitioner will be given first preference for allotment.

2. Learned counsel will also take instructions as to whether any plan has been sanctioned for construction of new quarters. He will also inform the Court as to the timeline which is envisaged for construction of the new government quarters.

3. Renotify on 7th May, 2018.

4. *Dasti* under the signatures of Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/ak

$~62

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4246/2018

RRA REALTY VENTURES LLP ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Amit Khemka with Ms. Aditi Kharpate & Ms. Siddhi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent
Through: Mr.P.Bhardwaj, CGSC with Mr. Kanishk Arora, Adv. for UOI

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

CM Appl.16613/2018 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.4246/2018 & CM Appl.16612/2018

2. The main grievance of the petitioner is that it is unable to upload forms titled as: LLP 8 and LLP 11 for financial years 2016-17 and 2017-18.

2.1 It is the petitioner's case that this problem has occurred on account of the stand taken by the respondent that form LLP 3 has not been filed.

2.2 Counsel for the petitioner asserts that LLP 3 was filed and that LLP 8 and 11 have been accepted for financial years prior to 2016-17.

3. Mr. P.Bhardwaj, learned CGSC, who, appears on advance notice, says he would have to obtain instructions in the matter.

4. Issue notice.

5. Mr. P.Bhardwaj accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

6. In the meanwhile, the petitioner is given liberty to file hard copies for LLP 8 and 11 of financial years 2016-17 and 2017-18. This filing is permitted without prejudice to the rights and contentions of both parties.

7. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed within four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

8. Renotify the matter on 24.9.2018.

9. Dasti.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~86

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4275/2018, CM APP Nos.16685-686/2018

SAVINDER SINGH SARNA AND ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma with Mr. Rahul Rajpal, Mr. Naman Issrani & Mr. Arif, Advs.

versus

REGISTRAR OF COMPANIES AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners seeks to withdraw the petition with liberty to file a fresh petition.

2. Petition along with all pending applications is dismissed as withdrawn, as prayed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~14

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

\+ W.P.(C) 9832/2016

USHA INTERNATIONAL LIMITED ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. P.K.Bhalla with Ms. Divya Bhalla & Mr. Dhritiman Roy, Advs.

versus

THE SUB DIVISIONAL MAGISTRATE (VASANT VIHAR) AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi, ASC with Mr. Shashank S. Tiwari, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Counsel for the respondent seeks accommodation to file a counter affidavit. Let the needful be done within three weeks. I am informed that the Revisional Authority has not yet rendered a final decision in the Petition filed by the petitioner.

2. Accordingly, renotify the matter on 30th October, 2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018
ak

$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 2382/2017

NATHAN CHAUDHARY ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arun Kumar with Mr. Rishesh Mani Tripathi and Ms. Anjani Gupta, Advs.

versus

THE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Raghav Kumar Tiwari, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Anurag Malhotra, Adv. for DJB.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Mr. Arun Kumar, who appears for the petitioner, says that he wishes to file an additional affidavit to bring out the unfair treatment meted out to the petitioner. Let the needful be done within two weeks from today.

2. Counter affidavit, if any, be filed by respondent No.2 after receipt of the additional affidavit that the petitioner proposes to file.

3. Renotify the matter on 30.7.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~16

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10409/2016

AJAY KUMAR MEHRA ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

M/S ANSAL HOUSING CONSTRUCTION LTD. & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of either side.

2. Adverse orders are deferred.

3. Renotify the matter on 27.11.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~15

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10331/2016 & CM APP No.40625/2016

VINOD GUPTA & ORS ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arvind Nigam, Sr. Adv. with Mr. L.K. Bhushan, Ms. Raashi Beri, Mr. Nikhil Shada and Mr. Mehtab Singh, Advs.

versus

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Sandhya Kolhi, Adv. for R-1/SEBI.
Mr. D.S. Chauhan with Mr. Ankit, Advs. for R-2.
Mr. Sanjay Bhatt with Mr. Sumit Nagpal, Advs. for IDBI Bank.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Mr. Chauhan, who appears for respondent No.2/NSDL, says that he will take instructions in the light of the information sought by respondent No.2/NSDL vide its letter dated 9.4.2015.

2. Learned counsel for respondent No.2/NSDL will also take instructions regarding the communication dated 13.4.2015, addressed to respondent No.2/NSDL by the petitioner. By virtue of this communication, the information sought by respondent No.2/NSDL appears to have been furnished by the petitioner.

3. Renotify the matter on 23.5.2017.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~13

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6687/2016 & CM APPL. No. 9939/2017, 9946/2017

M/S GANDHI IMPEX ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. V.S. Negi, Adv.

versus

ADDL. DIRECTOR GENERAL, DIRECTOR OF REVENUE INTELLEGENCE (DZU) & ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Saransh Parashar, Adv. for Mr. P.C. Aggarwal, Adv. for DRI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that since a decision has been rendered by the Settlement Commissioner, he does not wish to press the petition any further.

2. Accordingly, writ petition is disposed of.

3. Consequently, pending applications shall also stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~12

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

\+ W.P.(C) 5375/2016 & CM APPL. No.22421/2016

VICTOR JAMESH ..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Biji Rajesh, Adv.

versus

RK JAIN ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Atul Krishna, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of the learned counsel for the respondent.

2. Renotify the matter on 16.11.2018.

3. In case the petitioner wishes to file a rejoinder, the same will be filed before the next date of hearing.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~11

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4903/2016 & CM APPL. No.46446/2016

BALBIR SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Narendra Sharma, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Harish Kumar Garg with Ms. Puran Kumari and Ms. Payal Agrawal, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. S.V. Rateria, Adv. for Mr. K.P. Gautam, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% **26.04.2018**

1. Mr. S.V. Rateria, who appears for respondent No.2, says that he has recently been engaged in this matter on behalf of respondent No.2.

2. Let a copy of the writ petition and the application for amendment along with annexures, etc. be served upon the counsel for respondent No.2.

3. Reply, if any, be filed within three weeks from today.

4. Renotify the matter on 18.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~10

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8625/2015

ROAD NO. 77 & 78 PUNJABI BAGH WEST
RESIDENT WELFARE ASSOCIATION ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. N.S. Dalal, Adv.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR ..... Respondent
Through: Ms. Shruti Munjal, Adv. for Mr. Ankur Chhibber, Adv. for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

CM APPL. No.26054/2015

1. Arguments heard.

2. Judgment reserved.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~28

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1531/2018 & CM Appl. No.6294/2018

SUNITA DEVI ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. The position was no different on the previous date of hearing.

2. Writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. Consequently, the pending application shall stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~29

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1561/2018

ANCHAL SINGHAL ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashesh Lal, Adv.

versus

THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
THROUGH: ITS SECRETARY AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Manish Mohan, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Report of the Registry is that process fee was not filed.

2. On steps being taken, notice shall issue to respondent No.3.

3. In the meanwhile, learned counsel for respondent No.1 & 2 is given leave to file the counter affidavit. Needful be done within four weeks from today.

4. Rejoinder, if any, will be filed before the next date of hearing.

5. Renotify the matter on 23.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~30

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1646/2018

M/S INDO CRYSTAL PVT. LTD. ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Girdhari Arora, Adv.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT ..... Respondent
Through: Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner will place on record by way of an affidavit the shops located in the mall known as "Ashirwad Metropolitan Mall" (now, known as "Jalsa Mall"), Industrial Area, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur.

2. Let an affidavit in that behalf be filed within one week from today.

3. An advance copy of the affidavit will be given to Mr. Mahajan, who, appears for the respondent. Mr. Mahajan will verify the value of the shops and place the said information on record by way of an affidavit.

4. Renotify the matter on 30.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~24, 25 & 26

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10334/2017

ALL INDIA PETROLEUM DEALERS ASSOCIATION (REGD.) AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pushkar Sood, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH: ITS SECRETARUY AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, CGSC for UOI.
Mr. Tushar Mehta, ASG with Ms. Mala Narayan, Mr. Rahul Narayan, Mr. Sahshwat Goel and Ms. Neha Dawar, Advs. for R-2.
Mr. Anil Kr. Batra with Mr. P. Sinha and Mr. Rudra Dutta, Advs. for R-3/BPCL.
Mr. Rajiv Dutta, Sr. Adv. with Mr. G. Sivabalamurugan, Mr. Dinesh and Mr. Vasantha Kumar, Advs. in CM No.3870/2018.
Mr. Debojyoti Bhattacharya with Mr. Rhhit Dutta, Advs. for North Bengal Petrol Dealers' Association.
Mr. Gaurav Kohli, Adv. for Intervener.

\+ W.P.(C) 10746/2017 & CM Appl. No.44012/2017

ALL HARYANA PETROLEUM DEALERS ASSOCIATION (REGD) AND ANR. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Mahale, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sandeep Mahapatra, Adv. for UOI.
Mr. Tushar Mehta, ASG with Ms. Mala Narayan, Mr. Rahul Narayan, Mr. Sahshwat Goel and Ms. Neha Dawar, Advs. for R-2.

\+ W.P.(C) 11246/2017 & CM Appl. No.45977/2017

BIHAR PETROLEUM DEALERS ASSOCIATION (REGD.) ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Praveen Kumar Rai, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Ripu Daman Bhardwaj, CGSC for UOI.
Mr. Tushar Mehta, ASG with Ms. Mala Narayan, Mr. Rahul Narayan, Mr. Sahshwat Goel and Ms. Neha Dawar, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

It is already passed 5.00 pm, renotify the matters on 23.5.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~23

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

\+ W.P.(C) 8824/2017 & CM Appl. No.36038/2017

COL. LR. JASROTIA (RETD.) ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. T.K. Joseph, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Akshay Makhija, CGSC with Mr. Aditya Goyal and Mr. Seerat Deep Singh, Advs. for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. No time left. It is already 5.00 p.m.

2. Renotify the matter on 11.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~22

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

\+ W.P.(C) 7974/2017

PRABHLEEN KAUR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shailendra Bhardwaj, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjib K. Mohanty with Mr. Amit Acharya, Advs. for R-1.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Mr. Mohanty, who appears for respondent No.1, has brought to Court a report dated 2.8.2017, prepared by an Officer of the Deputy Commissioner of Police (Special Branch) i.e., respondent No.2, in a sealed cover. The sealed cover was opened. The report is placed on record as the counsel for respondent No.1 says that what is stated in the report is also stated in the counter affidavit.

2. The report is accompanied by annexures, which need to be translated into English. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 will place on record translated annexures within two weeks from today.

3. The report is handed back to the counsel for respondent No.1.

4. Renotify the matter on 28.5.2018 in the category of 'After Notice Miscellaneous Matters'.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~21

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6254/2017

BABA BHIMRAO AMBEDKAR UNIVERSITY ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Kumar Mishra with Ms. Jahvi Sharma, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL COMMISSION OF SCHEDULE CASTE THROUGH: ITS CHARIMAN AND ORS ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Mukesh Tiwari, Adv. for Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Rajendra Sahu, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. Mr. Mukesh Tiwari, who appears for respondent No.1, seeks and is granted three weeks to file a counter affidavit. Rejoinder, if any, will be filed before the next date of hearing.

2. Renotify the matter on 15.10.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~18

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

\+ W.P.(C) 3570/2017

STAR PROPWELL PVT LIMITED ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. K. Sunil, Adv.

versus

STATE BANK OF INDIA (FORMERLY STATE BANK OF PATIALA) ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Umesh Burnwal, Adv. for Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. A request for accommodation is made on behalf of Mr. Jitendra Kumar, who is the main counsel for the respondent. Request is not opposed by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Renotify the matter on 26.9.2018.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc

$~27

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

\+ W.P.(C) 979/2018 & CM APPL. No.4148/2018, 15077/2018

NAVAL KISHORE KAPOOR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.J. Alva with Mr. Ankit Kaushal, Advs.

versus

NATIONAL INVESTIGATION AGENCY ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Siddharth Luthra, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

O R D E R

% 26.04.2018

1. The substantive prayer made in the writ petition is as follows:

> *"Issue a writ of mandamus, writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the Respondent/ National Investigation Agency, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi to return to the Petitioner his original passport being Passport No. K5721932."*

2. Insofar as CM Appl. No. 15077/2018 is concerned, the prayer made therein reads as follows:

> *"Allow the present Application and quash the Lookout Circular issued by the Respondent/NIA against the Applicant/Petitioner."*

3. Reply to the application has been handed over by the learned counsel for the respondent/NIA in Court, today; a copy of which has been handed over to me.

4. To be noted, it is not disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner

that the petitioner has already been returned his passport. Therefore, the main petition appears to have worked itself out.

5. Mr. Alwa, who appears for the petitioner, says that he has moved the captioned interlocutory application, for the reason that despite the petitioner having a valid passport in his favour, he is not allowed to cross immigration barrier because of a Look Out Circular ("LOC") being issued qua him.

5.1 On being queried, learned counsel says that he has not been served with a copy of the LOC.

6. Mr. Siddharth Luthra, learned Senior Counsel, who appears for respondent/NIA, confirms that a LOC has been issued vis-à-vis the petitioner. For this purpose reliance is placed on the reply to the application filed on behalf of the respondent/ NIA.

6.1 In the reply, broadly, the reason given for issuance of the LOC is that the petitioner is required to be investigated in a matter pertaining to, one, Mr. Zahoor Ahmed Shah Watali. It is alleged that the petitioner is a business partner of Mr. Zahoor Ahmed Shah Watali.

6.2 It is not disputed before me by Mr. Luthra, though, that, at present, the petitioner is not arraigned, as an accused in any criminal case.

7. Given this position, counsel for the petitioner says that the petitioner is willing to assist in the investigation being carried out by the respondent/NIA and that, he will join the process as and when duly notified in that behalf. Besides this it is also the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that in terms of Office Memorandum (O.M.) dated 27.10.2010, issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, the petitioner can be detained by taking recourse to LOC, only if, he was

accused of committing a cognizable offence. In this behalf reliance is placed on Clause 8(h) of the said O.M.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I am inclined to dispose of the writ petition and the pending applications with the following directions: -

(i) The respondent/NIA will serve a copy of the LOC on the petitioner. Along with the copy of the LOC the respondent/ NIA will also serve on the petitioner the grounds on which the LOC is issued qua him.

(ii) While doing so the respondent/ NIA will bear in mind the provisions of the aforementioned O.M. or any other instruction that may have been issued which empowers issuance of a LOC against a person who is not arraigned as an accused in a criminal case.

9. Let the needful be done within one week from today.

10. The petitioner will have liberty to challenge the same in case the situation demands that the LOC and the grounds on which it has been issued needs to be assailed.

11. Writ petition and applications are disposed of.

12. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018/pmc