



\$~66

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6910/2026 & CM APPL. 33893/2026**

EPS PROJECTS PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manoj Kumar Garg and Mr.
Shivam Garg, Advs.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA REPRESENT BY MINISTRY OF CORPORATE
AFFAIRS & ORS.**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Akash Vajpai, CGSC with Mr.
Harsh Bajpai, Adv. for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

18.05.2026

1. This petition has been filed for quashing of the impugned order dated 13th June 2025 passed by the Regional Director, Northern Region, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, New Delhi [***“Regional Director”***], in relation to an application moved under *Section 16* of the Companies Act, 2013 [***“Companies Act”***] for rectification of the name of petitioner/Company at the behest of respondent no. 4. Respondent no. 4 is named as ***“EPS Instrumentation Private Limited”*** incorporated in 1994, whereas the petitioner/Company is in the name of ***“EPS Project Private Limited”***, incorporated in 2021.

2. At the outset, counsel for petitioner states that they could not appear before the Regional Director since show-cause notice was not duly received by them.

3. Counsel for respondent no.4/Regional Director, however, points out to



paragraph 3 of the impugned order, wherein it is noted that the respondents (*petitioners herein*) had chosen not to appear for the hearing despite service, as per the postal tracking record/report. Thereafter, an order came to be passed without an effective hearing being afforded to petitioner/Company. For ease of reference said paragraph is extracted as under:

“Hearing in the matter was scheduled on 25.02.2025 and 19.03.2025 vide notices dated on 22.01.2025 and 28.02.2025 which was issued to both the parties to appear before this Forum. Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate on behalf of applicant company has appeared on scheduled dates of hearing. However, none for the respondents preferred to appear for hearing despite service as per postal tracking record/report.”

4. Counsel for petitioner further submits out that petitioner/Company have 140 employees, and admits that he was an *Ex-Director* of respondent no. 4/Company.
5. It would be imperative if these aspects are canvased before the Regional Director so that the *principle of natural justice* are duly adhered to.
6. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of, with a direction that the matter be remanded back to the Regional Director for re-hearing.
7. The parties along with their counsels shall appear before the Regional Director, and upon issuance of a direction from the Regional Director, compliances shall be undertaken within a three months’ timeline.
8. The Court has not made any observations on the merits of the matter, and the Regional Director shall be at liberty to consider the matter on its own merits after hearing the parties.
9. Meanwhile, the impugned order dated 07th May 2026 passed by the Regional Director is set aside. Regional Director shall pass a fresh order after



hearing the parties.

10. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of.

11. Pending applications, if any, are also disposed of as being rendered infructuous.

12. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

MAY 18, 2026/MK/tk