

\$~60

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

Judgment pronounced on: 06.03.2018

+ W.P.(C) 2003/2018 & CM Nos.8236-37/2018

BISHNU NARAYAN SINGH & ANR Petitioners

Through : Mr. Raj Rishi,
Ms. Preeti Kumra and
Mr. Nirbhey Kumar Pathak,
Advts.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR Respondents

Through : Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj,
CGSC with Ms. Anubha
Bhardwaj, Adv.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

%

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J. (ORAL)

CM No.8237/2018 (exemption)

1. Allowed subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 2003/2018 & CM No.8236/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, 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 of AD Technosys Private Limited (in short ADTPL). The name of ADTPL 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 ADTPL had not been carrying on business for more than three years.

4. Besides this, I am informed that the petitioners are also active Directors on the Board of the company named as Daily Digital Private Limited which is active and functional.

4.1. Counsel for the petitioners says that since petitioners' name were included in the impugned list of disqualified directors for the financial years 2014-16, their roles as a Directors is impeded insofar as the other company is concerned, which is active and functional.

4.2. Counsel for the petitioners says that since the petitioners do not wish to revive ADTPL, 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 three 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 three weeks from today. In addition thereto, for the moment, respondent no.2/Registrar of Companies will also activate the petitioners' DIN and DSC.

6. Consequently CM No.8236/2018 shall stand closed.

7. *Dasti*.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MARCH 06, 2018/mk