

\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(COMM) 1226/2016**
SUPER CASSETTES INDUSTRIES PVT LTD Plaintiff

Through: Mr. K.K. Khetan, Adv.

Versus

MANTHAN BROADBAND SERVICES PVT LTD..... Defendant
Through: Mr. Aditya Vaibhav Singh & Ms.

Varchana Taneja, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

% **30.10.2018**

IA No.12753/2017 (of the defendant under Order VII Rule 10 of the CPC)

1. The counsel for the applicant / defendant and the counsel for the plaintiff have been heard.
2. The plaintiff has instituted this suit for permanent injunction restraining the applicant / defendant, situated at Kolkata and carrying on business of supplying Ground Cable Network to other Cable TV providers in Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal including Ranchi and Kolkata, from infringing the copyright held by the plaintiff in cinematograph films, sound recording and / or literary works, musical works etc. and for ancillary reliefs.
3. The suit was entertained and vide *ex parte* order dated 5th December 2016, while issuing summons of the suit to the applicant / defendant, the applicant / defendant was restrained from infringing the copyright of the plaintiff. The said interim order has continued till now.
4. The applicant / defendant, besides filing the written statement and to which a replication has been filed by the plaintiff, has also filed this application seeking return of plaint owing to this Court lacking territorial jurisdiction.

4. The counsel for the applicant / defendant has argued that the plaintiff has invoked the territorial jurisdiction of this Court referring to Section 62(2) of the Copyright Act, 1957 and pleading having its registered office at New Delhi. Attention is next invited to the dicta of the Division Bench of this Court in ***Ultra Home Construction Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Purushottam Kumar Chaubey*** 227 (2016) DLT 320 laying down that under Section 62(2) of the Copyright Act, where the plaintiff has a principal office at one place and the cause of action has arisen at the place where the subordinate office of the plaintiff is located, the plaintiff would be deemed to carry on business at the place of its subordinate office and not at the place of the principal office and the plaintiff can sue at the place of the subordinate office and cannot sue, under the Scheme of Section 62(2) of the Copyright Act, at the place of the principal office. Attention is next invited to para no.1 of the reply to the preliminary submissions in the replication filed by the plaintiff where the plaintiff has admitted having a subordinate office at Kolkata. It is thus argued that the plaintiff cannot invoke the territorial jurisdiction of this Court taking benefit of Section 62 of the Copyright Act.

5. Per contra, the counsel for the plaintiff draws attention to the same para no.1 of the reply to the preliminary submissions in the replication where the plaintiff, after admitting having a subordinate office at Kolkata, has *inter alia* pleaded that (i) the cause of action has accrued to the plaintiff not only at Kolkata but also in Ranchi, Orissa and at other places in West Bengal where also the defendant is supplying its Cable TV network and thus Section 62 is not applicable in the present case; and, (ii) the branch office of

the plaintiff situated in Kolkata does not deal with cable licencing and allied business; the plaintiff has various divisions and Cable TV Division does not have office in Kolkata and the said division is situated in New Delhi. The counsel for the plaintiff has thus contended that this Court has territorial jurisdiction.

6. I am unable to agree with the contentions of counsel for the plaintiff.

7. Merely because the cause of action may have accrued to the plaintiff at places other than the place where the plaintiff has its subordinate office and at which other places the plaintiff may not be having a subordinate office, will not dilute what has been held by the Division Bench in *Ultra Home Construction Pvt. Ltd.* supra. It is not the case of the plaintiff that the plaintiff, by institution of the suit at Kolkata where admittedly the plaintiff has subordinate office, cannot seek the same relief against the defendant as has been sought in this suit.

8. As far as the second contention is concerned, the cause of action is not merely of the Cable TV Division of the plaintiff but of the plaintiff. Copyright is a valuable right and the infringement thereof by another affects the plaintiff in entirety and once the plaintiff has a subordinate office at Kolkata, there is again no reason for not following the dicta of the Division Bench. The counsel for the applicant / defendant in this regard has also argued that the plaintiff is engaged in businesses which result in the plaintiff having a copyright in the works whether literary or musical or cinematograph, in the works produced by the plaintiff.

9. The counsel for the plaintiff, on enquiry as to what business the plaintiff has at Kolkata, states that the plaintiff is carrying on business of sale

of sale of white goods at Kolkata. However, no such pleading has been made.

10. Even otherwise, the spirit in which the *Ultra Home Construction Pvt. Ltd.* supra has been pronounced, pursuing the suit in this Court would cause more prejudice to the defendant who has no office here, than to the plaintiff if the plaintiff were to institute the suit for the same relief as claimed in this suit at Kolkata, where plaintiff admittedly has subordinate office.

11. The counsel for the defendant, on enquiry states that if plaintiff files the suit at Kolkata, the defendant would have no objection to the territorial jurisdiction.

12. The application is thus allowed and disposed of.

CS(COMM) 1226/2016

13. Resultantly, the plaint is ordered to be returned to the plaintiff for filing in the Court of appropriate territorial jurisdiction.

14. The suit is disposed of.

15. Interim orders to continue till 3rd December, 2018. If there is no interim order thereafter, the interim order earlier granted in this suit shall lapse automatically.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.

OCTOBER 30, 2018

‘gsr’..

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

+ CS(OS) 920/1994, CCP(O) No.89/2000, IA Nos.1913/2001, 4474/2003,
1325/2004, 2994/2007, 3322/2007, 9937/2007 & 12972/2008
VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs
Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.
Versus
SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS. Defendants
Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND
CS(OS) 921/1994, IAs No.9872/2007 & 12962/2008
VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs
Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 (Satish Aggarwal
Group).
Versus
SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS Defendant
Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND
CS(OS) 953/1994, IAs No.9922/2007 & IA No.12974/2008
VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs
Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 & 6 (Satish
Aggarwal Group).
Versus
SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P LTD. & ORS Defendants
Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 1514/1994, CCP(O) No.129/2010, IAs No.3674/2010, 8608/2010, 15003/2010, 2847/2011, 20226/2011, 788/2013, 16353/2013, 15141/2015, 11911/2016, 1459/2018, 1520/2018 & 12329/2018

VINEDALE DISTILLER LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

Versus

SATISH KR. AGGARWAL & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
D-1&6.

AND

CS(OS) 244/1997 & IA No.14153/2011

VINDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P. LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 775/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

ADNAN INVESTMENTS CONSULTANTS & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 776/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Page 2 of 4

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

B.D.A BREWERIES & DISTILLERIES LTD & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal, Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra, Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta Advs. for Sanman Group.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

% **30.10.2018**

IA No.14933/2018 (of the Sanman Distributors Ltd. under Section 151 CPC for urgent orders and directions).

1. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. has contended (i) that the immovable property of Vinedale Distilleries Limited which is the only asset of the said company was mortgaged with the Dena Bank which had initiated proceedings before Debt Recovery Tribunal (DRT) for recovery of its dues; (ii) that a mortgage decree was passed in the said proceedings and there was imminent threat of the property being auctioned; (iii) Dena Bank had transferred the debt to Asset Reconstruction Company and the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd., with the order of the DRT, has offered to purchase the debt from the said Asset Reconstruction Company and also paid a sum of approximately Rs.72 crores in the DRT. It is stated that nothing thus remains in this litigation.
2. However on enquiry, the senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group are also parties before the DRT.
3. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group also states that the value of the immovable property is much more than the amount which the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. claims to have deposited with the DRT.

4. I am unable to agree with the aforesaid contention of senior counsel for applicant/Sanman Distributors Limited.
5. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. then states that in the application, other directions for safeguarding the property have been sought and of which, by an earlier order, S.K. Aggarwal Group appointed a Commissioner.
6. I have enquired from the counsels for the S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group whether any reply is required to be filed to the application.
7. They seek two weeks' time to file the replies.
8. The replies be filed as aforesaid.
9. Rejoinders within further two weeks thereafter.
10. List the application on 26th November, 2018.
CS(OS) 920/1994, CS(OS) 921/1994, CS(OS) 953/1994, CS(OS) 1514/1994, CS(OS) 244/1997, CS(OS) 775/2009, CS(OS) 776/2009.
11. The suits are also listed for further hearing. However only half an hour time of the Court remains. The senior counsel for Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that he will conclude in one session.
12. Considering the Board of this Court, it would not be possible for me to schedule the next date of hearing before early January, 2019.
13. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group reminds of the direction dated 15th December, 2017 of the Supreme Court to conclude the hearing within six months thereof.
14. The counsels if so desire can make the requisite application before the appropriate fora.
15. List for hearing on 15th, 16th and 17th January, 2019.

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CS(OS) 920/1994, CCP(O) No.89/2000, IA Nos.1913/2001, 4474/2003,
1325/2004, 2994/2007, 3322/2007, 9937/2007 & 12972/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS. Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

+ CS(OS) 921/1994, IAs No.9872/2007 & 12962/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 (Satish Aggarwal
Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS Defendant

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 953/1994, IAs No.9922/2007 & IA No.12974/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 & 6 (Satish
Aggarwal Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

Page 1 of 4

CS(OS) 1514/1994, CCP(O) No.129/2010, IAs No.3674/2010, 8608/2010,

15003/2010, 2847/2011, 20226/2011, 788/2013, 16353/2013, 15141/2015,
11911/2016, 1459/2018, 1520/2018 & 12329/2018

VINEDALE DISTILLER LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

Versus

SATISH KR. AGGARWAL & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
D-1&6.

AND

CS(OS) 244/1997 & IA No.14153/2011

VINDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P. LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 775/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

ADNAN INVESTMENTS CONSULTANTS & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 776/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Page 2 of 4

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar

Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

B.D.A BREWERIES & DISTILLERIES LTD & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

30.10.2018

**IA No.14933/2018 (of the Sanman Distributors Ltd. under Section 151 CPC
for urgent orders and directions).**

1. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. has contended (i) that the immovable property of Vinedale Distilleries Limited which is the only asset of the said company was mortgaged with the Dena Bank which had initiated proceedings before Debt Recovery Tribunal (DRT) for recovery of its dues; (ii) that a mortgage decree was passed in the said proceedings and there was imminent threat of the property being auctioned; (iii) Dena Bank had transferred the debt to Asset Reconstruction Company and the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd., with the order of the DRT, has offered to purchase the debt from the said Asset Reconstruction Company and also paid a sum of approximately Rs.72 crores in the DRT. It is stated that nothing thus remains in this litigation.

2. However on enquiry, the senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group are also parties before the DRT.

3. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group also states that the value of the immovable property is much more than the amount which the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. claims to have deposited with the DRT.

Page 3 of 4

4. I am unable to agree with the aforesaid contention of senior counsel for

applicant/Sanman Distributors Limited.

5. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. then states that in the application, other directions for safeguarding the property have been sought and of which, by an earlier order, S.K. Aggarwal Group appointed a Commissioner.

6. I have enquired from the counsels for the S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group whether any reply is required to be filed to the application.

7. They seek two weeks' time to file the replies.

8. The replies be filed as aforesaid.

9. Rejoinders within further two weeks thereafter.

10. List the application on 26th November, 2018.

CS(OS) 920/1994, CS(OS) 921/1994, CS(OS) 953/1994, CS(OS) 1514/1994, CS(OS) 244/1997, CS(OS) 775/2009, CS(OS) 776/2009.

11. The suits are also listed for further hearing. However only half an hour time of the Court remains. The senior counsel for Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that he will conclude in one session.

12. Considering the Board of this Court, it would not be possible for me to schedule the next date of hearing before early January, 2019.

13. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group reminds of the direction dated 15th December, 2017 of the Supreme Court to conclude the hearing within six months thereof.

14. The counsels if so desire can make the requisite application before the appropriate fora.

15. List for hearing on 15th, 16th and 17th January, 2019.

OCTOBER 30, 2018/‘pp’..

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

Page 4 of 4

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CS(OS) 920/1994, CCP(O) No.89/2000, IA Nos.1913/2001, 4474/2003,
1325/2004, 2994/2007, 3322/2007, 9937/2007 & 12972/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS. Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 921/1994, IAs No.9872/2007 & 12962/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 (Satish Aggarwal
Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS Defendant

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

+ CS(OS) 953/1994, IAs No.9922/2007 & IA No.12974/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 & 6 (Satish
Aggarwal Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

Page 1 of 4

CS(OS) 1514/1994, CCP(O) No.129/2010, IAs No.3674/2010, 8608/2010,

15003/2010, 2847/2011, 20226/2011, 788/2013, 16353/2013, 15141/2015,
11911/2016, 1459/2018, 1520/2018 & 12329/2018

VINEDALE DISTILLER LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

Versus

SATISH KR. AGGARWAL & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
D-1&6.

AND

CS(OS) 244/1997 & IA No.14153/2011

VINDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P. LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 775/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

ADNAN INVESTMENTS CONSULTANTS & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 776/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Page 2 of 4

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar

Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

B.D.A BREWERIES & DISTILLERIES LTD & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

30.10.2018

IA No.14933/2018 (of the Sanman Distributors Ltd. under Section 151 CPC for urgent orders and directions).

1. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. has contended (i) that the immovable property of Vinedale Distilleries Limited which is the only asset of the said company was mortgaged with the Dena Bank which had initiated proceedings before Debt Recovery Tribunal (DRT) for recovery of its dues; (ii) that a mortgage decree was passed in the said proceedings and there was imminent threat of the property being auctioned; (iii) Dena Bank had transferred the debt to Asset Reconstruction Company and the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd., with the order of the DRT, has offered to purchase the debt from the said Asset Reconstruction Company and also paid a sum of approximately Rs.72 crores in the DRT. It is stated that nothing thus remains in this litigation.

2. However on enquiry, the senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group are also parties before the DRT.

3. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group also states that the value of the immovable property is much more than the amount which the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. claims to have deposited with the DRT.

Page 3 of 4

4. I am unable to agree with the aforesaid contention of senior counsel for

applicant/Sanman Distributors Limited.

5. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. then states that in the application, other directions for safeguarding the property have been sought and of which, by an earlier order, S.K. Aggarwal Group appointed a Commissioner.

6. I have enquired from the counsels for the S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group whether any reply is required to be filed to the application.

7. They seek two weeks' time to file the replies.

8. The replies be filed as aforesaid.

9. Rejoinders within further two weeks thereafter.

10. List the application on 26th November, 2018.

CS(OS) 920/1994, CS(OS) 921/1994, CS(OS) 953/1994, CS(OS) 1514/1994, CS(OS) 244/1997, CS(OS) 775/2009, CS(OS) 776/2009.

11. The suits are also listed for further hearing. However only half an hour time of the Court remains. The senior counsel for Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that he will conclude in one session.

12. Considering the Board of this Court, it would not be possible for me to schedule the next date of hearing before early January, 2019.

13. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group reminds of the direction dated 15th December, 2017 of the Supreme Court to conclude the hearing within six months thereof.

14. The counsels if so desire can make the requisite application before the appropriate fora.

15. List for hearing on 15th, 16th and 17th January, 2019.

OCTOBER 30, 2018/‘pp’..

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

Page 4 of 4

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CS(OS) 920/1994, CCP(O) No.89/2000, IA Nos.1913/2001, 4474/2003,
1325/2004, 2994/2007, 3322/2007, 9937/2007 & 12972/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS. Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 921/1994, IAs No.9872/2007 & 12962/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 (Satish Aggarwal
Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS Defendant

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 953/1994, IAs No.9922/2007 & IA No.12974/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 & 6 (Satish
Aggarwal Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

+ CS(OS) 1514/1994, CCP(O) No.129/2010, IAs No.3674/2010, 8608/2010, 15003/2010, 2847/2011, 20226/2011, 788/2013, 16353/2013, 15141/2015, 11911/2016, 1459/2018, 1520/2018 & 12329/2018

VINEDALE DISTILLER LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

Versus

SATISH KR. AGGARWAL & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
D-1&6.

AND

CS(OS) 244/1997 & IA No.14153/2011

VINDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P. LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 775/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

ADNAN INVESTMENTS CONSULTANTS & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 776/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

B.D.A BREWERIES & DISTILLERIES LTD & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal, Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra, Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta Advs. for Sanman Group.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

30.10.2018

IA No.14933/2018 (of the Sanman Distributors Ltd. under Section 151 CPC for urgent orders and directions).

1. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. has contended (i) that the immovable property of Vinedale Distilleries Limited which is the only asset of the said company was mortgaged with the Dena Bank which had initiated proceedings before Debt Recovery Tribunal (DRT) for recovery of its dues; (ii) that a mortgage decree was passed in the said proceedings and there was imminent threat of the property being auctioned; (iii) Dena Bank had transferred the debt to Asset Reconstruction Company and the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd., with the order of the DRT, has offered to purchase the debt from the said Asset Reconstruction Company and also paid a sum of approximately Rs.72 crores in the DRT. It is stated that nothing thus remains in this litigation.
2. However on enquiry, the senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group are also parties before the DRT.
3. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group also states that the value of the immovable property is much more than the amount which the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. claims to have deposited with the DRT.

4. I am unable to agree with the aforesaid contention of senior counsel for applicant/Sanman Distributors Limited.
5. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. then states that in the application, other directions for safeguarding the property have been sought and of which, by an earlier order, S.K. Aggarwal Group appointed a Commissioner.
6. I have enquired from the counsels for the S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group whether any reply is required to be filed to the application.
7. They seek two weeks' time to file the replies.
8. The replies be filed as aforesaid.
9. Rejoinders within further two weeks thereafter.
10. List the application on 26th November, 2018.
CS(OS) 920/1994, CS(OS) 921/1994, CS(OS) 953/1994, CS(OS) 1514/1994, CS(OS) 244/1997, CS(OS) 775/2009, CS(OS) 776/2009.
11. The suits are also listed for further hearing. However only half an hour time of the Court remains. The senior counsel for Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that he will conclude in one session.
12. Considering the Board of this Court, it would not be possible for me to schedule the next date of hearing before early January, 2019.
13. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group reminds of the direction dated 15th December, 2017 of the Supreme Court to conclude the hearing within six months thereof.
14. The counsels if so desire can make the requisite application before the appropriate fora.
15. List for hearing on 15th, 16th and 17th January, 2019.

OCTOBER 30, 2018/'pp'..

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

Page 4 of 4

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CS(OS) 920/1994, CCP(O) No.89/2000, IA Nos.1913/2001, 4474/2003,
1325/2004, 2994/2007, 3322/2007, 9937/2007 & 12972/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS. Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 921/1994, IAs No.9872/2007 & 12962/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 (Satish Aggarwal
Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS Defendant

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 953/1994, IAs No.9922/2007 & IA No.12974/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 & 6 (Satish
Aggarwal Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 1514/1994, CCP(O) No.129/2010, IAs No.3674/2010, 8608/2010, 15003/2010, 2847/2011, 20226/2011, 788/2013, 16353/2013, 15141/2015, 11911/2016, 1459/2018, 1520/2018 & 12329/2018

VINEDALE DISTILLER LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

Versus

SATISH KR. AGGARWAL & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
D-1&6.

AND

+ CS(OS) 244/1997 & IA No.14153/2011

VINDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P. LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 775/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

ADNAN INVESTMENTS CONSULTANTS & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 776/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Page 2 of 4

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

B.D.A BREWERIES & DISTILLERIES LTD & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal, Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra, Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta Advs. for Sanman Group.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

30.10.2018

IA No.14933/2018 (of the Sanman Distributors Ltd. under Section 151 CPC for urgent orders and directions).

1. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. has contended (i) that the immovable property of Vinedale Distilleries Limited which is the only asset of the said company was mortgaged with the Dena Bank which had initiated proceedings before Debt Recovery Tribunal (DRT) for recovery of its dues; (ii) that a mortgage decree was passed in the said proceedings and there was imminent threat of the property being auctioned; (iii) Dena Bank had transferred the debt to Asset Reconstruction Company and the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd., with the order of the DRT, has offered to purchase the debt from the said Asset Reconstruction Company and also paid a sum of approximately Rs.72 crores in the DRT. It is stated that nothing thus remains in this litigation.
2. However on enquiry, the senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group are also parties before the DRT.
3. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group also states that the value of the immovable property is much more than the amount which the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. claims to have deposited with the DRT.

4. I am unable to agree with the aforesaid contention of senior counsel for applicant/Sanman Distributors Limited.
5. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. then states that in the application, other directions for safeguarding the property have been sought and of which, by an earlier order, S.K. Aggarwal Group appointed a Commissioner.
6. I have enquired from the counsels for the S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group whether any reply is required to be filed to the application.
7. They seek two weeks' time to file the replies.
8. The replies be filed as aforesaid.
9. Rejoinders within further two weeks thereafter.
10. List the application on 26th November, 2018.
CS(OS) 920/1994, CS(OS) 921/1994, CS(OS) 953/1994, CS(OS) 1514/1994, CS(OS) 244/1997, CS(OS) 775/2009, CS(OS) 776/2009.
11. The suits are also listed for further hearing. However only half an hour time of the Court remains. The senior counsel for Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that he will conclude in one session.
12. Considering the Board of this Court, it would not be possible for me to schedule the next date of hearing before early January, 2019.
13. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group reminds of the direction dated 15th December, 2017 of the Supreme Court to conclude the hearing within six months thereof.
14. The counsels if so desire can make the requisite application before the appropriate fora.
15. List for hearing on 15th, 16th and 17th January, 2019.

OCTOBER 30, 2018/'pp'..

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

Page 4 of 4

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CS(OS) 920/1994, CCP(O) No.89/2000, IA Nos.1913/2001, 4474/2003,
1325/2004, 2994/2007, 3322/2007, 9937/2007 & 12972/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS. Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 921/1994, IAs No.9872/2007 & 12962/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 (Satish Aggarwal
Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS Defendant

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 953/1994, IAs No.9922/2007 & IA No.12974/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 & 6 (Satish
Aggarwal Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 1514/1994, CCP(O) No.129/2010, IAs No.3674/2010, 8608/2010, 15003/2010, 2847/2011, 20226/2011, 788/2013, 16353/2013, 15141/2015, 11911/2016, 1459/2018, 1520/2018 & 12329/2018

VINEDALE DISTILLER LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

Versus

SATISH KR. AGGARWAL & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
D-1&6.

AND

CS(OS) 244/1997 & IA No.14153/2011

VINDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P. LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

+ CS(OS) 775/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

ADNAN INVESTMENTS CONSULTANTS & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 776/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Page 2 of 4

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

B.D.A BREWERIES & DISTILLERIES LTD & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal, Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra, Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta Advs. for Sanman Group.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

30.10.2018

IA No.14933/2018 (of the Sanman Distributors Ltd. under Section 151 CPC for urgent orders and directions).

1. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. has contended (i) that the immovable property of Vinedale Distilleries Limited which is the only asset of the said company was mortgaged with the Dena Bank which had initiated proceedings before Debt Recovery Tribunal (DRT) for recovery of its dues; (ii) that a mortgage decree was passed in the said proceedings and there was imminent threat of the property being auctioned; (iii) Dena Bank had transferred the debt to Asset Reconstruction Company and the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd., with the order of the DRT, has offered to purchase the debt from the said Asset Reconstruction Company and also paid a sum of approximately Rs.72 crores in the DRT. It is stated that nothing thus remains in this litigation.
2. However on enquiry, the senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group are also parties before the DRT.
3. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group also states that the value of the immovable property is much more than the amount which the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. claims to have deposited with the DRT.

4. I am unable to agree with the aforesaid contention of senior counsel for applicant/Sanman Distributors Limited.
5. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. then states that in the application, other directions for safeguarding the property have been sought and of which, by an earlier order, S.K. Aggarwal Group appointed a Commissioner.
6. I have enquired from the counsels for the S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group whether any reply is required to be filed to the application.
7. They seek two weeks' time to file the replies.
8. The replies be filed as aforesaid.
9. Rejoinders within further two weeks thereafter.
10. List the application on 26th November, 2018.
CS(OS) 920/1994, CS(OS) 921/1994, CS(OS) 953/1994, CS(OS) 1514/1994, CS(OS) 244/1997, CS(OS) 775/2009, CS(OS) 776/2009.
11. The suits are also listed for further hearing. However only half an hour time of the Court remains. The senior counsel for Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that he will conclude in one session.
12. Considering the Board of this Court, it would not be possible for me to schedule the next date of hearing before early January, 2019.
13. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group reminds of the direction dated 15th December, 2017 of the Supreme Court to conclude the hearing within six months thereof.
14. The counsels if so desire can make the requisite application before the appropriate fora.
15. List for hearing on 15th, 16th and 17th January, 2019.

OCTOBER 30, 2018/'pp'..

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

Page 4 of 4

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CS(OS) 920/1994, CCP(O) No.89/2000, IA Nos.1913/2001, 4474/2003,
1325/2004, 2994/2007, 3322/2007, 9937/2007 & 12972/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS. Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 921/1994, IAs No.9872/2007 & 12962/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 (Satish Aggarwal
Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS LTD. & ORS Defendant

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 953/1994, IAs No.9922/2007 & IA No.12974/2008

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
plaintiffs No.1 to 4 & 6 (Satish
Aggarwal Group).

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 1514/1994, CCP(O) No.129/2010, IAs No.3674/2010, 8608/2010, 15003/2010, 2847/2011, 20226/2011, 788/2013, 16353/2013, 15141/2015, 11911/2016, 1459/2018, 1520/2018 & 12329/2018

VINEDALE DISTILLER LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

Versus

SATISH KR. AGGARWAL & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
D-1&6.

AND

CS(OS) 244/1997 & IA No.14153/2011

VINDALE DISTILLERIES LTD. & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs.

Versus

SANMAN DISTRIBUTORS P. LTD. & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

CS(OS) 775/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar
Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for
Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

ADNAN INVESTMENTS CONSULTANTS & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal,
Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra,
Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta
Advs. for Sanman Group.

AND

+ CS(OS) 776/2009

VINEDALE DISTILLERIES LIMITED & ORS Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Jai Dehadrai, Mr. Ch. Kameswar Rao and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advs. for Satish Aggarwal Group.

Versus

B.D.A BREWERIES & DISTILLERIES LTD & ORS Defendants

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar and Mr. Akhil Sibbal, Sr. Advs. with Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra, Mr. Saurabh Seth, Ms. Nitya Gupta Advs. for Sanman Group.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

30.10.2018

IA No.14933/2018 (of the Sanman Distributors Ltd. under Section 151 CPC for urgent orders and directions).

1. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. has contended (i) that the immovable property of Vinedale Distilleries Limited which is the only asset of the said company was mortgaged with the Dena Bank which had initiated proceedings before Debt Recovery Tribunal (DRT) for recovery of its dues; (ii) that a mortgage decree was passed in the said proceedings and there was imminent threat of the property being auctioned; (iii) Dena Bank had transferred the debt to Asset Reconstruction Company and the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd., with the order of the DRT, has offered to purchase the debt from the said Asset Reconstruction Company and also paid a sum of approximately Rs.72 crores in the DRT. It is stated that nothing thus remains in this litigation.
2. However on enquiry, the senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group are also parties before the DRT.
3. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group also states that the value of the immovable property is much more than the amount which the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. claims to have deposited with the DRT.

4. I am unable to agree with the aforesaid contention of senior counsel for applicant/Sanman Distributors Limited.
5. The senior counsel for the applicant/Sanman Distributors Ltd. then states that in the application, other directions for safeguarding the property have been sought and of which, by an earlier order, S.K. Aggarwal Group appointed a Commissioner.
6. I have enquired from the counsels for the S.K. Aggarwal Group and A.K. Aggarwal Group whether any reply is required to be filed to the application.
7. They seek two weeks' time to file the replies.
8. The replies be filed as aforesaid.
9. Rejoinders within further two weeks thereafter.
10. List the application on 26th November, 2018.
CS(OS) 920/1994, CS(OS) 921/1994, CS(OS) 953/1994, CS(OS) 1514/1994, CS(OS) 244/1997, CS(OS) 775/2009, CS(OS) 776/2009.
11. The suits are also listed for further hearing. However only half an hour time of the Court remains. The senior counsel for Sanman Distributors Ltd. states that he will conclude in one session.
12. Considering the Board of this Court, it would not be possible for me to schedule the next date of hearing before early January, 2019.
13. The counsel for S.K. Aggarwal Group reminds of the direction dated 15th December, 2017 of the Supreme Court to conclude the hearing within six months thereof.
14. The counsels if so desire can make the requisite application before the appropriate fora.
15. List for hearing on 15th, 16th and 17th January, 2019.