

\$~52

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

+ W.P.(C) 611/2018

ARVIND KUMAR TRIVEDI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Ashish Virmani, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA

..... Respondent

Through: Mr P. S. Singh with Ms Annu Singh
and Mr Rajpal Singh, Advocates for
UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

22.01.2018

CM No.2679/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 611/2018 & CM No.2678/2018

2. At the oral request of the petitioner, the Registrar of Companies, Delhi and Haryana (ROC) is impleaded as respondent no.2. Learned counsel for the respondent/UOI accepts notice on behalf of the respondents

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning a “lists of disqualified directors” published by respondent nos. 1 and 2 to the extent that it includes the petitioner’s name.

4. The petitioner claims that he is the Director of a private company named VRPS Engineers Pvt. Ltd. (hereafter ‘the Company’). The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner unequivocally states that the Company

has not carried out any business and its bank account is also not in operation for the past three years. The petitioner also did not file the requisite returns as required under the Companies Act, 2013 (hereafter 'the Act'). Consequently, the petitioner has incurred the disqualification under Section 164(2) of the Act.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner makes an unequivocal statement, on instruction of the petitioner, that the petitioner is desirous of availing of the Condonation of Delay Scheme -2018 (hereafter 'CODS - 2018'). However, since the Company has been struck off from the Register of Companies, he has been disabled from availing the benefits of CODS - 2018.

6. The petitioner is also not in a position to seek revival of the Company by filing an appeal under Section 252 of the Act as, admittedly, the Company has not carried out any business and was liable to be struck off from the Register. The petitioner states that, in fact, he would voluntarily seek dissolution of the Company under Section 248(2) of the Act, if he is given an opportunity to do so.

7. This Court is of the view that since the Company is not carrying out any business and its bank account has not been operated for over three years, the petitioner ought to be provided the benefit of the CODS - 2018. Accordingly, this Court directs as under:-

(a) The petitioner may file all the requisite returns in relation to the Company to avail the CODS - 2018.

- (b) The petitioner may also file the necessary resolutions and documents for voluntarily striking off the name of the Company as required under Section 248(2) of the Act.
- (c) The petitioner would also make a necessary application under CODS - 2018 along with the requisite charges.
- (d) The aforesaid documents and applications will not be submitted online but in hardcopies to the Registrar of Companies.

8. The Registrar shall scrutinize the same, and if the same are found to be otherwise in accordance with Section 248(2) of the Act, the petitioner would be granted the benefit of the CODS - 2018. The removal of the Company from the Register under Section 248(1) of the Act would be deemed to be under Section 248(2) of the Act, and the petitioner's application under CODS - 2018 would be sympathetically considered by the Registrar.

9. Since an unequivocal statement is made by the petitioner that he would pay the necessary charges and make the necessary application under the CODS - 2018, the impugned list of the disqualified directors, in as much as it includes the name of the petitioner, is stayed till 31.03.2018 or up till such time as the respondents take a final decision in the matter.

10. This order has been passed with due assistance of the learned counsel for the respondents, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case.

11. It is further clarified that the aforesaid order is made on the basis of the unequivocal statements made on behalf of the petitioner above and in the

event the statements are found to be incorrect, the petitioner would be liable to be proceeded against Contempt of Court in addition to being subjected to other proceedings.

12. The petition and the pending application are disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JANUARY 22, 2018
MK