



\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 11707/2024 & CM APPL. 48668/2024

VIVEK CHHATRE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sajal Manchanda,
Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH MINISTRY OF
CORPORATE AFFAIRS & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vinay Yadav, SPC
with Ms. Kamna Behrani
and Mr. Ansh Kalra, Adv.
for R-1.

Mr. Zoheb Hossain, adv.
for R-2 (through VC)

Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Mr.
Azeez Mushtaque and Mr.
Suradhish Vats, Adv. for
R-2.

Mr. Rajiv Nayar, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Karun
Mehta, Mr. Yugam Taneja
and Mr. Karan Bhootra,
Adv. for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

24.02.2025

%

1. By the present petition, the petitioner seeks following reliefs :

- a) *issue a writ of mandamus or writ of any such nature to direct R2 NFRA to enforce its order dated 29 March 2023 (Annexure No. 1) and rectify the deficiencies in accounting disclosures by R3 MHRIL that have already been identified by R2 NFRA in a timebound manner; and*
- b) *issue a writ of mandamus or writ of any such nature to direct R2 NFRA to make*

W.P.(C) 11707/2024

Page 1 of 3



- recommendations to the Central Government to formulate accounting standards for adoption by R3 MHRIL should such a need arise; and*
- c) to issue a writ of mandamus by directing R2 NFRA to initiate an investigation against R 4 & R 5 to examine misconduct on their part while conducting the statutory audit of R3 MHRIL; and/ or*
- d) any other relief as deemed appropriate by this Hon'ble Court in interest of equity and justice.*

2. The petitioner, on an earlier occasion, had filed a writ petition, being W.P.(C) 12985/2022, pointing out certain irregularities, including, accounting and auditing irregularities in the functioning of Respondent No. 3 company.

3. The aforesaid writ petition was disposed of by order dated 18.01.2023. By the said order, Respondent No. 2 authority—National Financial Reporting Authority (**NFRA**) was directed to look into the issues raised by the petitioner. Respondent No. 2 authority, passed an order dated 29.03.2023, passing certain directions to Respondent No.3 company and its auditors.

4. The grievance of the petitioner is that the said order has not been complied with.

5. In the opinion of this Court, once an order has already been passed by an authority giving directions to be complied with by a company, the petitioner has no locus to file a subsequent petition seeking orders for monitoring of compliance by the High Court.

6. Mr. Rajiv Nayar, learned senior counsel for Respondent No. 3 company, submits that the directions as communicated by NFRA have already been complied with.

7. Mr. Zoheb Hossain, learned counsel for NFRA, submits that the jurisdiction of NFRA is limited to passing directions as



provided in Section 132 of the Companies Act, 2013.

8. He submits that Respondent No. 2 authority is cognizant of its responsibility and as and when any further orders are required to be passed, the same would be done in accordance with law.

9. The petitioner seems to be aggrieved that he is not aware of any proceeding or action being taken by Respondent No. 2 authority.

10. The petitioner is at liberty to take appropriate steps for seeking information from NFRA.

11. No orders are required to be passed in the present petition.

12. The present petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.
Pending application(s) also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

FEBRUARY 24, 2025

'KDK'