

\$~31

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

Judgment pronounced on: 19 February 2018

+ CCP(CO.) 4/2018

NEETU PATRO

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rahul, Advocate.

versus

IYOGI TECHNICAL SERVICES PVT.LTD

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Nakul Jain, Advocate.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

%

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J. (ORAL)

1. This is an application filed under sections 11 & 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. The assertion of the applicant is that the respondent company is in breach of the directions contained in order dated 12.12.2017.

2. A perusal of the order dated 12.12.2017 would show that the Court had directed the respondent company's counsel to serve a copy of the scheme on the counsel for the petitioner within three days from that date. Counsel for the petitioner says that the needful has not been done.

3. Mr. Nakul Jain, who appears on advance notice has today furnished a copy of the scheme to the counsel for the petitioner.

Furthermore, counsel for the respondent says that meeting of creditors is fixed on 6.4.2018 and 7.4.2018. Counsel for the petitioner has made a note of the same.

3.1 In addition thereto, counsel for the respondent company says that a formal notice will be sent to the petitioner which would indicate the date, time and venue of the meeting. The statement of the counsel is taken on record.

4. In view of the above, to my mind, the contempt petition need not be taken further. It is accordingly disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 19, 2018

av