

\$~55

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

Judgment pronounced on: 7 March, 2018

+ W.P. (C) 2098/2018

VANSHIKA TARACHANDANI AND ANR. Petitioners

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi, Ms. Preeti
Kumra and Mr. Raj Rishi, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR. ... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Digpaul, CGSC with
Ms. Madhuri Dhingra, Adv. for
UOI

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J. (ORAL)

CM No.8687/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P. (C) 2098/2018 & CM No.8686/2018

2. Issue notice. Mr. Ajay Digpaul 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 petitioner no.1 was appointed as Director on the Board of Ideal Aviationnet Private Limited (for short 'IAPL') and Vector Star Trans Services Private Limited (for short 'VSTS'), whereas, petitioner no.2 was appointed as Director on the Board of VSTS only. The names of VSTS and IAPL were 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 VSTS and IAPL had not been carrying on business for more than three years.

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

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

6. 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*.

6.1 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 ten (10) days from today.

6.2 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.

6.3 Needful will be done by the petitioners within ten (10) days 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 APPL. Nos. 8686/2018 shall stand closed.

7. *Dasti*.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MARCH 7, 2018/rb