

\$~44

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

Judgment pronounced on: 9.3.2018

+ **W.P.(C) 2150/2018, CM APPL.8906/2018**

SANJAY KUMAR CHAUDHARY Petitioner
Through: Mr. Shobhan Mahanti, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondent
Through: Mr. Rohit Saroj, Adv. for
Mrs. Bharathi Raju, CGSC for R-1
& 2.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

%

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL.8906/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.2149/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Rohit Saroj, who appears for respondent no.1 and 2, accepts notice.

2.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner 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)11275 /2017, titled: *Harpreet Singh Batra & anr. v. Union of India and Ors.* This aspect is not disputed by the counsel for respondent no.1 & 2.

Therefore, waiting for a counter affidavit would serve no purpose as the stand of respondent no.1 & 2 is the same as in *Harpreet Singh Batra (supra)*.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of the Company by the name: Topaz Power Technology Private Limited (“TPTPL”). The name of TPTPL was struck off from the Register of Companies on account of failure to file the requisite financial statements and annual returns.

4. Besides this, I am informed that the petitioner is also a Director on the Boards other companies, which are active and functional as per Annexure P-2.

4.1 Counsel for the petitioner says that since the petitioner’s name was included in the impugned list of disqualified directors for the financial years 2014-16, his role as Director is impeded insofar as the active companies are concerned.

4.2. Counsel for the petitioner says that since the petitioner does not wish to revive TPTPL, he would take steps under Section 248 (2) of the Companies Act, 2013 in consonance with the directives contained in *Harpreet Singh Batra (supra)*.

4.3 Furthermore, counsel for the petitioner says that he 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 respondent no.1 & 2

will follow the directives contained in *Harpreet Singh Batra (supra)*. It is made clear that the directives contained therein will apply to the petitioner *mutatis mutandis*.

5.1 The petitioner 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 petitioner, will remain stayed till 31.3.2018 or, till such time the respondent no.1 & 2 take requisite decision with regard to the request of the petitioner 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 petitioner within three weeks from today. In addition thereto, for the moment, respondent no.2/Registrar of Companies will also activate the petitioner's DIN and DSC.

6. It is also made clear that the aforesaid order will be subject to the final outcome of the appeals which, I am told, are pending before Division Bench I.

7. *Dasti*.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MARCH 09, 2018/pmc