

\$~34

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

Judgment pronounced on: 28.2.2018

+ **W.P. (C) 1939/2018, CM APPL.8047/2018**

APOORV RANJAN SHARMA & ANR. Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sameer Rastogi with Mr.
Ankit Parashar, Ms. Pooja and
Mr. Yatin Sachdeva, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC for R1
and R2.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

%

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL.8047/2018 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P. (C) 1939/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Vivek Goyal, CGSC, who appears for respondents, accepts notice.

2.1 Learned counsel for the petitioners says that the issue which arises for consideration in this case is covered by the judgment of another Single Judge of this Court dated 21.12.2017, passed in W.P.(C)11381/2017 titled: *Sandeep Singh & Anr. v. Registrar of Companies & Ors.* This aspect is not disputed by the counsel for the respondents. Therefore, waiting for a counter affidavit would serve no

purpose as the stand of the respondents is the same as in *Sandeep Singh & Anr. (supra)*.

3. It is the case of the petitioners that they were appointed as Directors on the Board of the Company by the name PA Venture Catalyst Pvt. Ltd. (“PAVC”). The name of PAVC was struck off from the Register of Companies on account of failure to file the requisite financial statements and annual returns.

3.1 Furthermore, the petitioners submitted that PAVC had not been carrying out business for more than seven years.

4. Besides this, I am informed that insofar as petitioner no.1 is concerned, he is also a Director on the Boards of the following companies, which are active and functional:

- (i) Venture Catalysts Pvt. Ltd,
- (ii) VPhrase Analytics Solutions Pvt. Ltd.
- (iii) Reconext Labs Pvt. Ltd.

4.1 Counsel for the petitioners says that since petitioners’ names were included in the impugned list of disqualified directors for the financial years 2014-16, their role as Directors is impeded insofar as the other companies are concerned which are active and running.

4.2 Counsel for the petitioners says that since the petitioners do not wish to revive PAVC, they would take steps under Section 248 (2) of the Companies Act, 2013 in consonance with the directives contained in *Sandeep Singh (supra)*.

4.3 Furthermore, counsel for the petitioners says that the petitioners would also like to avail the benefit of the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018.

5. Having regard to the assertions made in the petition and the records which are presently available with me, I am of the view that this petition can be disposed of with the direction that respondents will follow the directives contained in *Sandeep Singh (supra)*. It is made clear that the directives contained therein will apply to the petitioners *mutatis mutandis*.

5.1 The petitioners will, however, take steps both in consonance with the provisions of Section 248 (2) of the Companies Act, 2013 and under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 within a period of two weeks from today.

5.2 In order to facilitate this exercise, operation of the impugned list, insofar as it concerns the petitioners, will remain stayed till 31.3.2018 or, till such time the respondents take requisite decision with regard to the request of the petitioners made to them in consonance with the provisions under Section 248 (2) of the Companies Act, 2013 and under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018.

5.3 Needful will be done by the petitioners within two weeks from today. In addition thereto, for the moment, respondent no.2/Registrar of Companies will also activate the petitioners DIN and DSC.

6. *Dasti*.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

FEBRUARY 28, 2018

/vikas/