

01
29.08.2024
d.p.

**In The High Court At Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

**W.P.A 6809 of 2019
IA No. CAN 1 of 2019
(Old No. CAN 11666 of 2019)**

**Urmila Dhandhanja
-versus
Union of India & Ors.**

**Mr. Avinash Kankani.
...For UOI.**

None appears on behalf of the petitioner on repeated occasions.

Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the Union of India submits, upon instructions, that the relief prayed for by the petitioner has become infructuous because the period of disqualification under Section 164(2)(a) of the Companies Act, 2013 has expired.

Notice was served upon the petitioner and to the learned counsel. None is available.

Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner refused to accept the notice from the learned advocate representing the Union of India. The postal track report shows that the notice was served upon the petitioner directly.

The order dated 8th February, 2024 passed by a coordinate Bench in WPA 8700 of 2020 (Anup Bhartia -vs- Union of India & Ors.) has been placed before this

Court. It appears that the relief prayed for by the petitioner herein is similar to the relief prayed for in the matter of Anup Bhartia (supra). The Court was pleased to dismiss the matter of Anup Bhartia (supra) as infructuous.

In view of the above, the instant writ petition stands dismissed as 'infructuous'.

The notice of the learned advocate for the respondents addressed to the petitioner, the postal track report and the notice addressed to the learned advocate-on-record of the petitioner be retained with the records.

As the writ petition stands dismissed, the connecting application also stands disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order be supplied to the parties, if applied for, as early as possible.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)