

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
COMPANY APPLICATION NO.324 OF 2019
IN
COMPANY PETITION NO.728 OF 2015

Mukesh M. Borana (HUF)Applicant

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN

M/s National Steel IndustriesPetitioner

V/s.

The Official Liquidator of RTG
Infrastructure and Realtors Limited
(In Liquidation)Respondent

WITH
COMPANY APPLICATION NO.325 OF 2019
IN
COMPANY PETITION NO.728 OF 2015

M/s. RMB CapitalsApplicant

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN

M/s National Steel IndustriesPetitioner

V/s.

The Official Liquidator of RTG
Infrastructure and Realtors Limited
(In Liquidation)Respondent

WITH
COMPANY APPLICATION NO.330 OF 2019
IN
COMPANY PETITION NO.728 OF 2015

Manoj M. Borana (HUF)Applicant

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN

M/s National Steel IndustriesPetitioner

V/s.

The Official Liquidator of RTG
Infrastructure and Realtors Limited
(In Liquidation)Respondent

WITH
COMPANY APPLICATION NO.329 OF 2019
IN
COMPANY PETITION NO.728 OF 2015

Alpesh P. Borana (HUF)Applicant

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN

M/s National Steel IndustriesPetitioner

V/s.

The Official Liquidator of RTG
Infrastructure and Realtors Limited
(In Liquidation)Respondent

WITH
COMPANY APPLICATION NO.327 OF 2019
IN
COMPANY PETITION NO.728 OF 2015

Ramesh M. Borana (HUF)Applicant

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN

M/s National Steel IndustriesPetitioner

V/s.

The Official Liquidator of RTG
Infrastructure and Realtors Limited
(In Liquidation)Respondent

Mr. Akash P. Shah for applicant (all applications).
Mr. Mahendhar Aithe, Company Prosecutor present.

CORAM : K.R.SHRIRAM, J.
DATED : 9th FEBRUARY 2021

PC. :

COMPANY APPLICATION NO.324 OF 2019
WITH
COMPANY APPLICATION NO.325 OF 2019
WITH
COMPANY APPLICATION NO.330 OF 2019
WITH
COMPANY APPLICATION NO.329 OF 2019
WITH
COMPANY APPLICATION NO.327 OF 2019

1 At the outset, Mr. Aithe states that he has not been served a copy of the company applications. Mr. Shah states that an email was sent over a year ago to the office of the Official Liquidator but has no explanation as to why a hard copy was not served since the office of the Official Liquidator is hardly 100 metres from the office of Mr. Shah. Mr. Shah, however, undertakes to serve a copy of these company applications during the course of today upon Mr. Aithe personally.

2 Mr. Aithe states that since it is an application for condonation of delay in lodging the affidavit of proof of debt, if the Court is satisfied that the delay is sufficiently explained, the Court may pass such order as necessary. Mr. Shah states that all company applications, which are listed today, are identical and in every case there has been a delay of only 93 days.

3 I have considered company application no.324 of 2019 and also also accepted the statement of Mr. Shah that all other company applications, which are listed today, are identical. Therefore, I am passing a common order in all the company applications.

4 The delay is condoned. Official Liquidator shall consider the affidavit of proof of debt of applicants and dispose the same in accordance with law. I clarify that I have not made any observation on the merits of the claim.

5 Mr. Aithe states that he will consider each of the company application to see whether they are identical and is there any variance

between the company applications.

6 Company applications accordingly stand disposed.

(K.R. SHRIRAM, J.)

Gauri A.
Gaekwad

Digitally
signed by
Gauri A.
Gaekwad
Date:
2021.02.10
18:16:16
+0530