



\$~95

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1975/2026**

RITA BANERJEE

.....Petitioner

Through: Appearance not given.

versus

**INVESTOR EDUCATION AND PROTECTION FUND
AUTHORITY AND ORS**

.....Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

12.02.2026

CM APPL. 9653/2026 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 1975/2026

1. The petitioner claims to be the sole legal heir of late Shri Benoy Kumar Banerjee and late Smt. Nirmal Nalini Debi, who during their lifetime, were the registered holders of equity shares of R2-CESC Ltd. which shares, along with unpaid dividends, were subsequently transferred to the Investor Education and Protection Fund-respondent no.1 in terms of Section 124(6) of the Companies Act, 2013.
2. It is contended that on 26.12.2024, the petitioner filed Form IEPF-5



through the portal of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs seeking a refund and transmission of equity shares and unpaid dividends pertaining to Folio No. B00091 and Folio No. D00367 of CESC Ltd. The total claim, as per the petitioner, comprised 3360 equity shares of the said Company (1680 shares being in each folio) and dividends spanning from the financial year 2009-2010 till the financial year 2023- 2024.

3. It appears that on 16.12.2025, the petitioner received an email from respondent no.1 informing that her application dated 26.12.2024 stands rejected, the same is extracted as under:

“Dear User, The claim filed under SRN No AB2260688 has been rejected as per Rule 7(7) of the IEPFA Rules, 2016, as the company has failed to submit the revised verification report for the SRN as per timeline mentioned in the rule.

The claimant may file a fresh claim.

Regards IEPF Administrator Note: This is a system generated message, please do not reply to it.”

4. Learned counsel appearing for respondent no.2, on advance instructions, submits that since there were two Folios and the petitioner had submitted only one application, therefore, the same was not accepted. She, however, submits that if the petitioner completes the formalities with respect to both the Folios numbers separately, respondent no.2 would be in a position to take an appropriate decision in accordance with law.

5. Without going into the requirement of filing independent applications, or the permissibility of one common application; in order to put a quietus to the litigation, it would be appropriate if the petitioner files two independent applications with respondent no.2.

6. If the petitioner does so, let respondent no.2 take an expeditious decision without any further delay.



7. Petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J
FEBRUARY 12, 2026/P/KSR