

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL
KOLKATA BENCH
KOLKATA

C.P. No. 15 /2017

CORAM: 1. Hon'ble Member (J) Ms. Manorama Kumari

ATTENDANCE-CUM-ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING ON 22nd March, 2017, 10.30 A.M

Name of the Company		Ritu Pathak. -Versus- Hapamuni Herbals & Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd. & Ors	
Under Section		241/242	
Sl. No.	Name & Designation of Authorized Representative (IN CAPITAL LETTERS)	Appearing on behalf of	Signature with date

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1) | Chhatrapal Sengupta
Advocate | Respondent
1, 2, 3 | Ch. Sengupta
22/3/2017 |
| 2) | Praveen Kumar
Advocate | Respondent-
1, 2 & 3 | Praveen Kumar
22/3/2017 |
| 3) | SIDDHARTHA MURARKA, PES | Respondent 4 | Siddhartha
22/03/17 |
| 4) | SANDIP SARKAR | " | S. Sarkar
22/3/17 |
| 5) | ABHJIT NAGEE | " | Abhijit
22/03/17 |
| 1. | REETOSROTO ICR MITRA, Adv | } Rehr | 22/3/17 |
| 2. | PATITA PARAN BISNOOK, Adv | | |
| 3. | SHAVAN MITRA Adv | | |
| 1) | DIPANKAR DAS, Adv | Respondent B | DD
22/3/17 |

ORDER

The Ld. Lawyer on behalf of the petitioner as well as on behalf of the respondent Nos. 1,2,3,4 & 5 are present.

The respondents Nos. 1 to 3 have filed their reply against the main CP to which the petitioner has prayed for some time to file the rejoinder.

The Respondent No. 4 appeared today and also prayed for some time to file the reply.

Heard. The prayer is allowed. The Respondent No.4 is given 15 days' time to file the reply with copy to the petitioner and the petitioner is at liberty to file his rejoinder, if any within 10 days' time.

Perused the records. The service upon the respondent No.6 is returned with remark "left" given by the Postal Department.

In view of above, the petitioner is directed to make a paper publication in two newspaper one in local daily and another in national daily, widely circulated.

Heard both side on the order of status quo given on the last date i.e. on 14-02-2017 in absence of respondent(s).

The petitioner has prayed for further extension of the status quo order to which the Ld. Lawyer on behalf of the Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 vehemently opposed as any extension of the status quo order, shall prejudice the interest of the Company and will jeopardies the functioning of the Company as the company could not operate bank account consequent upon which the company could not meet out its day to day business and other ancilliary payments/discharge other statutory obligations.

Perused the pleadings and the documents.

On perusal of the record, it is found that the order of status quo was granted on 14-02-2017 only till next date i.e. up to 22-03-2017 in the absence of the respondent(s).

I find no ground to extend the status quo order further, as prayed by the petitioner as it will be prejudicial to the respondent(s) as the functioning of the company will come to stand still if they are not allowed to operate the bank account.

Fix the matter on 24-04-2017.


MANORAMA KUMARI
MEMBER(J)