

\$~40

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1434/2018**

GURUCHARAN SINGH AND ORS. .... Petitioners

Through Mr Anil Kumar Chandel, advocate with  
Mr Shashank Singh, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. .... Respondents

Through Mr Dev P. Bhardwaj, CGSC with  
Mr Satya Prakash Singh, Mr Surender Kumar,  
Advocate for Respondent No. 1 and Respondent  
No. 2/UOI.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU**

**ORDER**

% **16.02.2018**

**CM No. 5911/2018**

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

**W.P.(C) 1434/2018 and CM No. 5910/2018**

3. The petitioners have 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 names of the petitioners.
4. The petitioners claim that they are the Directors of a private company named Sujan Automobiles Private Limited (hereafter ‘the Company’). The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners unequivocally states that the

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

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners makes an unequivocal statement, on instruction of the petitioners, that the petitioners are 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, they have been disabled from availing the benefits of CODS - 2018.

6. The petitioners are 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 petitioners state that, in fact, they would voluntarily seek dissolution of the Company under Section 248(2) of the Act, if they are given an opportunity to do so.

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

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

- (b) The petitioners 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 petitioners 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 petitioners 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 petitioners' application under CODS - 2018 would be sympathetically considered by the Registrar.

9. Since an unequivocal statement is made by the petitioners that they 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 names of the directors, 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 petitioners above and in

the event the statements are found to be incorrect, the petitioners 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**

**FEBRUARY 16, 2018**

pkv