

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL  
BENGALURU BENCH, BENGALURU**

CP No. 498/2018  
U/s 241, 242 & 59 of the Companies Act, 2013  
R/w Rule 20 of NCLT Rules, 2016

In the matter of

**Piyush Periwal & Ors.**

---

**Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Centennial Infrastructure Development Pvt. Ltd.  
(Formerly known as Precision Extrusion Pvt. Ltd.) & Ors.  
No.6, Ground Floor, 2<sup>nd</sup> Cross  
Nandi Durga Road, Jayamahal  
Bengaluru 560 046**

---

**Respondent**

**Coram:**

1. Hon'ble Shri Rajeswara Rao Vittanala, Member (Judicial)
2. Hon'ble Shri Ashok Kumar Mishra, Member (Technical)

**Date of Order: 12<sup>th</sup> September, 2018**

**Parties / Counsels Present:**

For the Petitioner:

---

NIL

**ORDER**

Per: **Rajeshwara Rao Vittanala, M (J)**

- 1) None appeared for the Petitioner. The Petition is filed by Shri Piyush Periwal, Shri ML Periwal (Deceased) represented by his legal heir Shri Piyush Periwal, Shri Chandrakanta Periwal, Smt. Madhulika Periwal and ML Periwal Charitable Trust (Petitioners) against M/s. Centennial Infrastructure Development Private Limited and Another (Respondent), U/s 241, 242 & 59 of the Companies Act, 2013 R/w Rule 20 of the NCLT Rule, 2016 by inter-alia seeking for directing to look into the affairs of the



1<sup>st</sup> Respondent Company and to order for an enquiry by proper investigation, examination and pass necessary orders, etc.

- 2) The Registry has allotted Diary No. 1036/2018, and on scrutiny of the Petition on 24.04.2018, the office has found several defects in the Petition, and the same was communicated to the Counsel/PCS, through email for compliance by granting 10 days time to comply with the objection and to submit the same in the Registry. The said office objections were received by the PCS/Counsel on 19/06/2018, but so far the/Counsel PCS has not taken any steps to rectify the office objections.
- 3) Since the Petitioner or its Representative failed to comply with the office objection, the case was posted for compliance of office objections on 04.09.2018. On 04.09.2018 also, neither Counsel nor any Representative appeared to represent the case before the Tribunal. Therefore, the case is directed to be posted it under the caption "For dismissal" on 12.09.2018. Today also none appears for the Applicants/Petitioners. Therefore, it shows that the Applicants/Petitioners are not interested to prosecute the case further, and thus it is liable to be rejected.
- 4) Hence, CP No. 498/2018 is hereby rejected for non-prosecution of the case and for non-compliance of office objections.

  
**(ASHOK KUMAR MISHRA)**  
**MEMBER, TECHNICAL**

  
**(RAJESWARA RAO VITTANALA)**  
**MEMBER, JUDICIAL**