

\$~114

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

+ W.P.(C) 4226/2018 & CM APP No.16557/2018

RAMESH GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Avadh Kaushik, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Manish Mohan and Mr. Bhagvan
Swarup Shukla, CGSCs with
Mr. Kamaldeep, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

26.04.2018

1. The petitioner have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the list of disqualified directors published by the respondent nos.1 & 2 to the extent that it includes the name of the petitioner.

2. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as a Director on the Board of companies namely:-

i. Crystal Restaurant and Banquet Private Limited (in short "CRBPL"),
and,

ii. Hallmark Media Private Limited (in short "HMPL")

(hereinafter referred to as "Companies"). The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the Companies have not carried out any business for the past two years and that its bank account has not been operated. Furthermore, the petitioner states that he had not filed the Companies' financial statements and statutory returns as required under the extant provisions of law. The petitioner avers that it is on account of the aforementioned infraction of law

that his name came to be included in the impugned list.

2.1 To be noted, the captioned writ petition was heard on 25.04.2018, wherein the counsel for the petitioners sought time to file an additional affidavit bringing on record as to the compliances made to have the Companies voluntarily struck off from the Register of Companies.

2.2 It is in this background that petitioners have filed affidavit dated 26.04.2018 via diary no. 119811.

3. In this matter, I am informed by the learned counsel for the official respondent nos.1 & 2 that the issues raised in the captioned matter are similar to those issues which have been raised before Division Bench-I in various matters pending before it.

4. Counsel for writ petitioner(s) are agreed that the interim directions passed by this court and those which have been passed by the Division Bench can form the basis of the disposal of the present writ petition with a right to revive the captioned petition, in respect of those issues which are not addressed by the Division Bench judgment.

5. Accordingly, the captioned writ petition is disposed of with the following directions:-

- (i) The operation of list of disqualified directors in so far as the inclusion of the name(s) of the writ petitioner(s) is concerned, shall remain stayed.
- (ii) The DIN and DSC of the writ petitioner(s) will stand activated.
- (iii) The writ petitioner(s) will have liberty to apply under the Condonation of Delay Scheme, 2018 (hereafter "Scheme"). Permission is granted to make the requisite filings in the form of hard copies.
- (iv) The writ petitioner(s) will deposit, if not deposited already, a sum of Rs.30,000/- qua each such company *vis-a-vis* whom steps for voluntary

striking off are required to be taken. The said amount will be deposited in the form of Fixed Deposit Receipt (FDR) with the Registry of this court on or before 15.05.2018. The FDR will be created in favour of the ROC.

(v) The amount deposited by way of FDR, as adverted to in clause (iv), will be in addition to other charges that would be payable under the Scheme. These sums will be deposited in the form of FDR as well. The writ petitioner(s) will also furnish their calculations in that behalf.

6. The writ petitioner(s) will abide by the Division Bench-I order dated 21.03.2018, passed in a batch of writ petitions, the lead petition being W.P. (C) 9439/2017, titled: *Atul Khosla & Anr. v. Union Of India and Ors.*

7. Liberty, however, is given both to the petitioner(s) and the official respondent nos.1 & 2 to revive the petition(s), in case, there are issues which are not covered by the Division Bench judgment.

8. Needless to say, the disposal of the writ petition will not come in the way of the official respondent nos.1 & 2 presenting their point of view before the Division Bench.

9. It is made clear that if there is any other company apart from the one mentioned in paragraph 2 above, whose name has been struck off from the Register of Companies, resulting in the inclusion of the petitioners' names in the impugned list of disqualified directors, then, this order will not come in the way of necessary consequences in law flowing from such circumstance.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.

11. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court master.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

APRIL 26, 2018

mk