

\$~49

*IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Judgment pronounced on: 09.03.2018

+ W.P.(C) 2166/2018 & CM No.8932/2018

KARANJIT SINGH CHOPRA Petitioner
Through : Ms. Shilpi Chowdhary, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through : Mr. Ravi Prakash, CGSC
with Mr. Nitish Gupta and
Mr. Farman Ali, Adv.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

%

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J. (ORAL)

1. Issue notice. Mr. Ravi Prakash, who appears for the respondents, accepts notice.

1.1. 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)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)*.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that he was appointed as a

Signature Not Verified

Signing Date:16.10.2024 16:56:32
Certify that the digital and physical files have
been compared and the digital data is as per
the physical file and no page is missing.

W.P.(C) 2166/2018

Page 1 of 3

Director on the Board of the Company by the name: *Singler Technology Private Limited (STPL)*. The name of STPL was struck off from the Register of Companies on account of failure to file the requisite financial statements and annual returns.

2.1 Furthermore, the petitioner submitted that STPL had not commenced operations since its incorporation.

3. Besides this, I am informed that the petitioner is also Director on the Boards of the following companies, which are active and functional:

(i) Nammo India Private Limited (in short "NIPL")

(ii) Raaws Agencies Private Limited (in short "RAPL")

3.1. 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 other companies are concerned which are active and functional.

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

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

4. 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

2

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

4.1 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 two weeks from today.

4.2 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 respondents 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.

4.3 Needful will be done by the petitioner within two weeks from today. In addition thereto, for the moment, respondent no.1/Registrar of Companies will also activate the petitioner's DIN and DSC.

5. 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.

6. Consequently CM No. 8932/2018 shall stand closed.

7. *Dasti.*



RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MARCH 09, 2018

mk