



\$~45 to 52

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 846/2020 & CRL. MA 3432/2020
DR. M.V. RAMANA RAO & ANRPetitioners
Through: None.

versus

STATE & ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
Mr. Sarul Jain, Advocate for
respondent no.2.

+ CRL.M.C. 851/2020 & CRL. MA 3443/2020
DR. M.V. RAMANA RAO & ANRPetitioners
Through: None.
versus

STATE & ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
Mr. Sarul Jain, Advocate for
respondent no.2.

+ CRL.M.C. 852/2020 & CRL. MA 3445/2020
DR. M.V. RAMANA RAO & ANRPetitioners
Through: None.
versus

STATE & ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
Mr. Sarul Jain, Advocate for
respondent no.2.

+ CRL.M.C. 854/2020 & CRL. MA 3449/2020
DR. M.V. RAMANA RAO & ANRPetitioners
Through: None.
versus



- STATE & ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
Mr. Sarul Jain, Advocate for
respondent no.2.
- + CRL.M.C. 856/2020 & CRL. MA 3453/2020
DR. M.V. RAMANA RAO & ANRPetitioners
Through: None.
versus
- STATE & ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
Mr. Sarul Jain, Advocate for
respondent no.2.
- + CRL.M.C. 857/2020 & CRL. MA 3455/2020
DR. M.V. RAMANA RAO & ANRPetitioners
Through: None.
versus
- STATE & ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
Mr. Sarul Jain, Advocate for
respondent no.2.
- + CRL.M.C. 858/2020 & CRL. MA 3457/2020
DR. M.V. RAMANA RAO & ANRPetitioners
Through: None.
versus
- STATE & ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
Mr. Sarul Jain, Advocate for
respondent no.2.
- + CRL.M.C. 859/2020 & CRL. MA 3459/2020
DR. M.V. RAMANA RAO & ANRPetitioners
Through: None.



versus

STATE & ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
Mr. Sarul Jain, Advocate for
respondent no.2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

22.10.2024

%

1. Learned counsel for the respondent No.2 submits that in the present case, the CIRP was initiated post filing of the complaints and that the petitioners are the director and the managing directors against whom the said proceedings are maintainable in terms of the decision in Ajay Kumar Radheyshyam Goenka Vs. Tourism Finance Corporation of India Ltd. reported as **(2023) 10 SCC 545**.
2. Be that as it may, considering that there is no appearance on behalf of the petitioners on previous dates of hearing, the petitions are dismissed in default for non-prosecution alongwith pending applications.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

OCTOBER 22, 2024/rd