

**IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL
ALLAHABAD BENCH**

Company Petition 60/ND/2011

(Under Section 397/398 of the Companies Act, 1956)

IN THE MATTER OF:

1. Kumud Bhargava

(304, Fancy Society, 19, vasundhra enclave, Delhi

..... **Petitioner**

Vs

2. Associated Chemical Industries (Kanpur) Pvt. Ltd.

(Registered Office at 123/369, Factory Area, Fazalganj, Kanpur-208012)

3. Sudhir Bhargava, Managing Director

(Resident of 7/203, Swarup Nagar, Kanpur)

4. Mrs Shashi Bhargava, Director.

(Resident of 7/203, Swarup Nagar, Kanpur)

5. Sh. Anurag Bhargava, Director.

(Resident of 7/203, Swarup Nagar, Kanpur)

.....**Respondents**

JUDGMENT/ORDER DELIVERED ON 31.08.2018

CORAM :

Sh. V.P. Singh, Hon'ble Member (Judicial)

Ms Saroj Rajware, Hon'ble Member (Technical)

For the Petitioner: S N Bhargava, Adv.

For the Respondent: Nishant Mishra, Adv, Vipin Khushwaha, Adv.

AS PER: Ms. Saroj Rajware, Member (Technical)

Order/Judgment

1. This Company Petition was originally filed by the Petitioners against the Respondents before the Hon'ble Company Law Board, New Delhi Bench, under Sections 397 and 398 of the Companies Act,

1956. The said Petition was transferred to this Tribunal on abolition of Company Law Board.

2. Petitioner was promoter Director of the company. She is presently holding 802 Equity shares of 100 each, fully paid up in the company.
3. Respondent No. 1 (R1) is a company having registered office at **123/369, Factory Area, Fazalganj, Kanpur-208012. The authorized share capital of respondent Company is Rs. 25,00,000 subscribed and paid-up share capital of Rs.5,00,000, divided into 5,000 equity shares of Rs.100 each.**
4. Respondent No.2 (R2) is the promoter- Director of the Company. He is presently holding 2,094 shares, of 100 each and is the Managing Director of the company from 27.10.1995.
5. Respondent No.3 (R3) is the Promoter Director of the company, she is the first and Permanent Director of the Company, she is presently holding 340 shares of 100 each in the company.
6. Respondent No.4 (R4) is Holding 1464 shares of Rs.100 each and working as Director of the company since 05.11.1997.

7. Facts of the case in the brief are as under: -

(a) Originally, the family business of manufacturing chemicals was being run as proprietary concern of Lt. Sri K.P Bhargava (Father of petitioner and R-2) in the name and style of M/s Associated Chemical Industries, later it was converted into partnership concern during year 1963, by taking R-2 as partner, later on petitioner also joined as a partner on 01.10.1976.

(b) The firm made profits and capital increased over the years, hence the Respondent Company was incorporated in the

year 1982 by the partner of the firm and R-3 and initially shareholding of the company was as under: -

Name of Shareholder	No. of Shares
Lt. Sh. KP Bhargava	2,364
Sh. Sudhir Bhargava (R2)	2,094
Mrs.Kumud Bhargava (Petitioner)	502
Mrs. Shashi Bhargava	40
Total no of shares	5,000

(c) Petitioner further stated that on 01.02.1994, Sri KP Bhargava (Father of petitioner and R-2), expired leaving behind the following heirs:

Name of the legal heirs	Relationship with deceased
Mrs.Ganga Bhargava	wife
Sh.Sudhir Bhargava(R-2)	son
Mrs Sushma Bhargava	Daughter
Mrs.Kumud Bhargava (Petitioner)	Daughter

(d) Hence petitioner alleged that since late Sh.KP Bhargava, was holding 2,364 shares in the company, all the aforesaid legal heirs would have been transmitted 591 shares each. However, with ulterior motive, R2, transmitted the shares on 07.12.1995 of Lt. Sh. KP Bhargava, to the following family members:

Name	No.of Shares
Mrs. Shashi Bhargava, R-3, wife of R-2	300
Mrs. Aparna Subramaniam, Daughter of R-2	300
Mr. Anurag Bhargava, son of R-2	1,464
Mrs. Kumud Bhargava, Petitioner	300
Total	2,364

(e) Further stated that alleged transmission was done in Board meeting held on 07.12.1995 in respect of which no notice of the meeting was send to the petitioner and submitted that the transmission of 300 shares was made to the petitioner without any request made by her and in the absence of probate/succession certificate and further submitted that R-2 forged the will of Lt. Sh KP Bhargava dated 11.08.1993, which was not registered. R-2 applied for the probate of the will (number as 47/90/1999) in the Court of 6th Addl District Judge, Kanpur Nagar, However, the impugned shares were not covered under the probate proceedings. Petitioner stated that she is contesting the probate proceedings and the alleged will is also under challenge by the petitioner in suit no 1560/2010 pending before the court of 2nd Addl Civil Judge (Senior Division) Kanpur Nagar. Petitioner has also challenged the

will dated 06.04.2009, of Mrs Ganga Bhargava (Mother of the Petitioner).

- (f) Petitioner through this petition alleged that company never sent any notice of the Board Meeting or the Shareholders meeting to the petitioner in spite of repeated request, in this regard copies of letter dated 29.06.1996, 09.08.1996, 11.05.2003, 05.06.2003, 05.06.2003 & 09.12.2003 are enclosed as **(Annexure D of the petition)**
- (g) Since the needed compliance was not made by the company, petitioner made a complaint dt. 06.02.2004, to the Department of Company Affairs, a copy of which is enclosed as **Annexure-E** and the matter was Pursued by the petitioner with the Department (RD, ROC Kanpur) time to time, and in this regard letter dated 05.08.2004 and 13.09.2004 (**enclosed as Annexure- F**), inspection of the books of accounts of the company was also made by the department and as a result prosecution under section 125, 138, 143, 172, 207, 219, 286, 299 of companies Act, 1956 were filed by ROC, against the company and its MD(R-2).
- (h) Petitioner stated that she received notice of Board meeting for the first time, vide letter dated 18.12.2004, in respect of which leave of absence was sought by the petitioner vide letter dated 29.12.2004. Copies of these letters are enclosed at **Annexure-G** and the next notice dated 24.08.2005, for holding the Board Meeting on 30.08.2005, which was received by the petitioner but due to short notice, leave of absence was sought by the petitioner in her letter dated

27.08.2005 and another notice dated 24.08.2005, for holding the same board meeting on 30.08.2005, was received by the petitioner, to which reply was again sent on 28.05.2005, Request was also made for sending agenda & minutes of Board meetings and also accounts for the year 2004-05. A mail was also sent on 10.09.2005, on 29.09.2005 and on 09.12.2005, by way of reminder. Copies of the same are enclosed at **Annexure-H**. Letters dated 16.09.2005 and 27.11.2005 were also addressed to Regional Director, Noida, in this regard, copies of which are enclosed at **Annexure-I**.

- (i) Petitioner stated that respondent company was again reminded by petitioner on 07.08.2007 to provide copies of documents, a copy of letter is enclosed at **Annexure-J**.
- (j) Petition further stated that the company vide letter dated 01.09.2007, informed the petitioner for the first time that she ceased to be Director, from 30.08.2005, since she absented from 3 consecutive Board meetings. A copy of letter dated 01.09.2007, which is enclosed at **Annexure-K**.
- (k) Petitioner stated that Respondent no.2, did not inform the petitioner about the dates of 3 meetings, allegedly not attended by her. The copy of the minutes of the said meetings have also not been furnished by Respondents, so far, in spite of her letters dated 05.09.2007 (enclosed at **Annexure-L**).
- (l) Hence petitioner has alleged that cessation of the office of the director of the petitioner, is bad in law because respondent have never informed about the 3 dates of Board Meetings and it is also not stated when the notices of the said meetings

were sent and petitioner states that she received 3 notices dt 18.12.2004, 24.08.2005 and 25.08.2005 for which leave of absence were dully sought and it is only after inspection of the Record of ROC, it is gathered from the Form-32 (**Enclosed as Annexure-N**), filed by the company, that petitioner ceased to be a Director on 30.08.2005 by operation of law for not attending 3 consecutive meetings of Board of Directors held on 30.03.2005,20.05.2005 and 30.08.2005.

(m) Hence petitioner submitted that no notices of these meetings was received by the petitioner and During 01.03.2005 to 09.07.2005, the petitioner was in Canada, which was in the Knowledge of the Respondents and if any case notices were sent to petitioner, it would have been received by the Petitioners Daughter who lives across the petitioner's house.

(n) Hence stated that removal of petitioner as Director under section 283(1)(g) of the Companies Act, 1956 is serious act of oppression of the petitioner, who is a minority shareholder.

(o) Further alleged that Respondent Company has never delivered to the petitioner share certificate in respect of her original shareholding of 502 share and subsequent transfer of 300 shares after death of Lt. KP Bhargava (Father of Petitioner and R-2), hence it is utter violation of provision of section 113 of the Companies Act, 1956.

(p) Consequently, stated that Respondent Company has taken on lease the factory premises from M/s Associated Chemical Industries, a firm in which R-2 and R-4 are partners and

during the year ending 31.03.2010, the company paid Rs1,44,000 as lease rent to the firm and Respondent Company is also selling its manufactured products on credit to this firm and payment to firm are more beneficial than other clients of the company. It is also submitted that during year ending 31.03.2010, the Respondent Company has Advances a loan of Rs.15,00,000 to M/s CSP Print & Packs (P) Ltd, in which R-2 and R-4 are interested on interest of 12% p.a, without any security.

(q) And further alleged that R-2 and R-4 are mismanaging the affairs of the company as the they have written off huge amount of bad debts during the year 31.03.2009 a sum of Rs.1,44,88,195 was written off resulting in loss to company during that year subsequently written off Rs.16,15,995 in the year ending on 31.03.2010 resulting further loss of Rs.23,16,599. Hence to these losses, no dividend was declared during these 2 years, which mainly affected the petitioner, in view of inter-related transaction with the company, it is submitted that no proper/ legal steps were taken to realize the debts of the company and information in this regard was sought by the petition vide letter dated 18.09.2010 (**annexed as annexure-o**), but the same has not been furnished, hence this is serious act of mismanagement on the part of the Respondents.

(r) Further petitioner has demanded supply of documents, for the period after 01.02.1994 in various letters addressed to company, last one on 02. 03.2011 (**annexed as annexure-s**)

and letter dated 08.03.2011 (Copy of ROC/RD), which was regarding inspection by her or representative, furnishing information/ documents e.t.c. fearing some problem by the respondents, her representative Shri SN Bhargava (Husband of petitioner) applied for Inspection vide letter dated 20.01.2011 (**enclosed as Annexure V**). petitioner stated that inspection was allowed to Sh SN Bhargava on 01.02.2011 but alleged that he was not allowed to inspect as representative of the petitioner. Thus, the facts remain that inspection of register etc., has still not been allowed and copies of documents still not been furnished by the Respondents, hence this is a serious matter of Oppression of the petitioner by the respondent.

(s)Hence petition through this petition has sought following relief: -

(a)The alleged vacation of office of Director, of the petitioner under section 283(1)(g) of the companies' act 1956, on 30.08.2005, be declared as null and void and petitioner be restored as a Director from that date:

(b)The alleged Board meeting held on 07.12.1995, in which transmission of shares held by Lt. Sh KP Bhargava, was approved, without application by the petitioner and notice of meeting to her as the than director, be declared as null and void and non-est:

(c) Respondents be directed to deliver share certificates in respect of 802 shares held by petitioner in the company.

(d) Petitioner also seek appointment of representative of petitioner as director, say Sh. S.N Bhargava:

(e) Such other order as may be deemed fit and proper.

8. Respondents have filed reply to the present petition and points taken by the respondents are as follows: -

(a) That the above petition is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed at the threshold because forgery of will of Lt K.P Bhargava and his wife Lt. Ganga Bhargava are categorically wrong and denied and clarified that the 300 shares of the Respondent Company were transmitted to the petitioner in the Board meeting held on 07.12.1995 as per the will of Lt K.P Bhargava dated 11.08.1993
(Copy of will is annexed as Annexure- R-1)

(b) Further stated that petitioner has already agitated the issue related to wills of her father Sh. Lt KP Bhargava and mother Lt. Ganga Bhargava respectively and true and correct facts of the pending status of the pending litigation in respect of above will is as under:

(i) R-2 applied for probate in respect of will of his Father Lt K.P Bhargava and the petitioner challenged the application vide case no 44/70/99, which is pending before 6th Addl District Judge, Kanpur.

- (ii) R-2 applied for probate in respect of two asset of his father Lt. K.P Bhargava (i) MTNL Bonds for Rs.50,000/- and (ii) Reserve Bank of India Bonds for Rs.30,000/- and petitioner filed case no 1560/2010 before the Court of 2nd Addl Civil Judge, challenging will of Lt. KP Bhargava and stated that petitioner has filed this case in year 2010 after 16 years after the execution of the will.
- (iii) Further, Petitioner has also challenged the will of her mother Lt. Ganga Bhargava vide case no 2371/2009 in the Hon'ble Court of Upper Civil Judge Senior Division-I, Kanpur Nagar, praying for stay on the execution of the will but the court of Hon'ble Civil Judge, Kanpur after taking into consideration all facts and circumstances, rejected the prayer of the stay of execution of the aforesaid will, hence petitioner filed appeal in the Hon'ble High court of Allahabad against aforesaid order and Hon'ble High court vide its order dated 22.04.2011 refused to stay the execution of the will of Lt. Ganga Bhargava. (**A Copy of the said order enclosed at Annexure R-3**)
- (c) Hence submitted that the Petitioner cannot be allowed to raise and agitate the similar issue before this court on the ground of Res- Judicata before of matter pending before the other court.

(d) Further regarding to allegation of petitioner of not sending of notices of the meeting, respondent stated that they have been regularly sending notices of Board meeting to the petitioner and whenever possible also intimating the date of proposed board meeting over phone to the petitioner and stated that they had not removed the petitioner but petitioner ceased to be director under the provision of Section 283(1) (g) of the Companies Act, 1956, on the ground of herself absenting from the three consecutive meetings of the Board of Director of the Respondent company (**Copies of three aforesaid notices along with postal/ courier receipts is enclosed as annexure No- R-4).**

(e) Respondent further stated that it is matter of record that Respondent Company allotted 25, 227,250 Shares to the petitioner on 28.05.1982,31.03.1983,29.09.1984 and alleged that petitioner, however, never signed the counter-foils of the aforesaid share certificate, except the 25 shares allotted to her on 28.05.1982 and 300 shares were transmitted to the petitioner on 07.12.1995 as per will of Lt. KP Bhargava. (**Copies of Folio.Nos 3&4 of the Register of Members of Share Ledger are enclosed as Annexure R-5)**

(f) Further stated that copies of counter-foil of issue of 502 and 300 equity shares are still lying undersigned (**Copies is annexed as Annexure R-6), the Respondent Company has been paying dividends on these shares,**

petitioner never objected to receipt of dividend on these shares, but rather has been writing letters to the respondent company and to ROC to send share certificates. The Respondent Company has many times written to petitioner that if share are not available with her or lost , the company is prepared and will issue duplicate shares after completing formalities as required in the Act but the petitioner, instead of agreeing to this proposition, has been writing letter to the ROC. Respondent Company has replied to all letter of the petitioner and same is annexed as (Annexure R-7, R-8, R-9, R-10, R11, R-12).

(g) Respondent further stated that petitioner has been making imaginary and false allegation against the respondent for the mismanagement, it is clarified that respondent decision for taking lease the factory premises of Associated Chemical Industries was a step towards specialization in manufacturing of speciality chemicals for leathers and it is business practice to advance loan to business entities when surplus fund were available to earn handsome interest on these loan. There is no violation of the Companies Act by Advancing Loan of Rs.15,00,000/- to M/s. CSP Prints & Packs Pvt.Ltd at the interest of 12% per annum but it is matter of fact that M/s CSP Prints & Packs Pvt.Ltd has returned the full amount of Rs.15,00,000/- and interest of Rs 2,51,900/- vide cheque no 397954 and 342510 dated 07.06.2011 and 18.07.2011 to the Respondent **(Copy of receipt of the**

Principal and interest amount received by the Respondent Company is enclosed as Annexure R-15)

- (h) Respondent has further admitted that they have written of bad debts from 2007-2010 to reflect a true and fair view of the state of business affairs of the respondent company and stated that they have been profit making company and only on the year 2009-2008 they had suffered the loss and that is due to not realization of some debts and for that company and directors have taken timely action, including filing of recovery suits before the concerned authorities and appropriate forum to mitigate the loss during the financial year 2008-09(***Respondent has annexed a Copies of the order of the IFC (Industrial Facilitation Council of the MSME) in favour of respondent company as Annexure R-16).***
- (i) Respondent has further stated that petitioner has been provided access to inspect and obtain copies of the document available to shareholders under company's act, however, she was not provided copies of the Board Meeting after she ceased to be director of the Respondent Company and stated the petitioner itself has admitted that her husband Sh S.N Bhargava had visited the Registered office of the Company on 01.02.2011 as proxy of her.(***Copies of the letter of the petitioner about the inspection carried on by them on 01.02.2011 and copy of the inspection register of the Respondent***

Company for inspection made on 11.06.2011 are enclosed as Annexure R-22)

(j) Hence stated that petitioner doesn't Deserve any relief as prayed and this petition is liable to be dismissed.

9. Petitioner has further replied to the reply of the respondent and stated that:

- (i) Petitioner denied the objection taken by the respondent stating that the act alleged by the petitioner are correct and under the preview of section 397/398 of the Companies Act .
- (ii) Petitioner further stated that Respondents have taken the stand that the petitioner neither attended any Board meeting since 1994 nor attended any AGM except in 2005, which was attended by her proxy, is wrong. Petitioner said they were in Board from 02.02.1994 to 30.08.2005 and petitioner rendered services to the Board during this period.
- (iii) Hence petition may be allowed and petitioner may be granted the relief sought.

10. It is matter of record that Hon'ble Company Law Board, New Delhi by its order dated 28.05.2013 decided the matter on merits and in view of concession granted by the respondent directed that petitioner be restrained as Director in the Respondent Company with immediate effect.

11. But the order dated 28.05.2013 of Hon'ble CLB was challenged by the Petitioner as well as Respondents vide Company Appeal No.5/ 2013 and 7/2013 respectively, before the Hon'ble Allahabad

High Court and the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court by separate judgements dated 30.11.2017 decided both the appeals and in the appeal No. 5/2013 by the Petitioner held that "impugned order of CLB is found to be justified and it require no interference" but in the order of appeal by respondent in company appeal No 7/2013 made observation which is reproduced here below:-

"Upon a consideration of the submission made and upon a perusal of the case law cited, this court finds substance in the submission of counsel for the appellant that the provision of section 283(1) (g) is a mandatory provision and mandatory provision, as held by Apex Court in Vijay Narayan(supra), cannot be waived.

The impugned order has been passed solely on the basis of a concession, which even if made, was of no consequence. Therefore, the impugned order in so far it restores the respondent on the post of Director on the basis of concession alone, cannot be sustained. The impugned order, to that extent is hereby, set-aside, and the matter is remanded back to Company Law Board to decide the question of validity of the respondent removal from the post of Director and also for consideration of the relief, if any, to be granted, after considering the rival claims on their merits.

12. Hence a question arises, whether removal of the petitioner under section 283(1)(g) of the Companies Act, 1956 is valid or not?
13. Heard the Ld. Counsel for the both the side at length and perused the record available.
14. It is relevant to produce provision of section 283(1)(g) of the Companies Act, 1956:

Section 283 in The Companies Act, 1956

283. Vacation of office by directors.

(g) he absents himself from three consecutive meetings of the Board of directors, or from all meetings of the Board for a continuous period of three months, whichever is longer, without obtaining leave of absence from the Board;

15. Since in the present matter petitioner has incurred disqualification under section 283(1)(g) of the Companies Act, 1956 on the ground that she was absent from the three consecutive meetings of Board of Directors held on 30.03.2005, 20.05.2005 and 30.08.2005, and has been ceased to be director of the respondent company from the same Board meeting dated 30.08.2005.
16. Petitioner has stated that respondents were aware that the petitioner will not be present in country during the period from 30.03.2005 and 20.05.2005 and will not be able to attend two Board meetings dated 30.03.2005 and 20.05.2005. Being close family member (Petitioner is sister of the R-2), the fact of her travel abroad was known to Respondents and Respondent has relied upon the notices sent to the address of the petitioner along with proof of despatch, stating that they have acted as per provision of the Companies Act, 1956 and petitioner itself has incurred disqualification by remaining absent in consecutive three Board Meetings. Petitioner stated that sending notices to her address in Delhi was a mere formality as it was known to the petitioners that she was out of country.
17. A further look into the evidences submitted by the petitioner shows that petitioner was out of the country from 01.03.2005 to

08.07.2005. (***Petitioner has annexed Copy of Visa as annexure c of the rejoinder***). During this period two board meetings were conducted by the respondents, one on 30.03.2005 and second on 20.05.2005. Since it is a closely held family company, it is unlikely that the respondents, members of the board, were not aware of the petitioner's absence. It was argued by the petitioner that it is quite natural that the petitioner would not leave the country without informing at least her mother, who was residing with the respondent.

It is a fact that the petitioner, did not inform respondents in writing in advance or seek leave of absence for the above two meetings, assuming that respondents were aware of her absence during this period. The respondents conducted two Board meeting, quickly, within a gap of 1.5 months only during the period of her absence. A perusal of visa and immigration stamp clearly shows that she left for Canada on 01.03.2005 and returned to India on 08.07.2005 and petitioner conducted two board meeting during this period.

18. Further it is observed that during the period of the third board meeting i.e on 30.08.2005 petitioner was in the country and on receipt of the notice dated 25.08.2005 on 27.08.2005, had replied by her email dated 27.08.2005 and 28.08.2005 to the official email address of the respondent company aci@aciindia.com seeking leave of absence for the meeting of Board of Directors going to held on 30.08.2005 stating as follows:

“In view of short notice, it is difficult to visit Kanpur and that, I would have been conveyed the date, when I was last in Kanpur and requested to register my leave of absence”.

But the Respondent firstly denied that they received any such mail, later stated that the e-mail was not a valid mode of communication and she should have sent letter by speed post. Hence from above stated facts it is clear that when the petitioner was in the country and when she received the notice dated 25.08.2005 on 27.08.2005 about board meeting scheduled on 30.08.2008, she did seek leave of absence from the Board on the ground that it was too short a notice to come to Kanpur and attend the board meeting (***Petitioner is resident of New Delhi***). She had also stated in her e-mail that had she been informed of the meeting in time, when she was in Kanpur, she could have attended the meeting.

Further vide email dated 10.09.2005 petitioner wrote to the respondent stating that:

“ I sent you 2 mails seeking leave of absence in attending the meeting. I also requested you to kindly forward copy of agenda and minutes”

*“ I have not received the annual report for 04-05. **Copy of the same with date when AGM is likely to be held may kindly be forwarded, so that I could plan the visit sufficiently in advance**”.*

This clearly reflects that petitioner was not able to attend the third board meeting, due to very short notice of time and had made a request to the respondent to intimate the date of next meeting (AGM) in advance so that she can attend the upcoming AGM.

19. Hence from perusal of the evidences and discussion of above stated fact, it is evident that respondent despite knowing that the

petitioner was out of country and will not be able to attend the Board meetings, convened two Board meetings of 30.03.2005 & 20.05.05 within a gap of one and a half months. For the third board meeting of 30.08.2005, Respondent did not provide notice to the petitioner sufficiently in advance. Notice dated 24.08.2005 was delivered only on 27.08.2005 and immediately on receipt of notice petitioner did seek leave of absence due to very short notice of only two days. Despite seeking leave of absence for third board meeting of 30.08.2008, respondent ignored her request for leave of absence on the ground that e-mail is not a valid mode of communication and with malafide intentions, taking advantage of provision of section 283(1)(g) of the Companies Act 1956 disqualified and removed the petitioner from the directorship in the same third board meeting dated 30.08.2005, without waiting for the next Board meeting, which could never be the intention of the law maker and statutes.

20. Hence, this tribunal hereby holds that removal of the petitioner in board meeting dated 30.08.2005 by malafide use of the mandatory provision of the 283(1)(g) of the companies Act,1956 is declared illegal and void.

21. Petition is allowed and this Tribunal hereby: -

ORDER

- (i) Petitioner be restored to Directorship w.e.f 30.08.2005 with concomitant benefits.
- (ii) R1 company is directed to file compliance certificate within 15 days from the date of order.

(iii) No order as to costs.

Copy of the order may immediately be issued to the
Petitioner, Respondent and ROC .

(Ms. SarojRajware)

Member (Technical)

Dated- 31.08.2018

(V.P Singh)

Member(Judicial)