National Company Law Tribunal

Allahabad Bench

CP NO. CIB 77/ACI/2017, CATIO. ATTENDENCE-CUM-ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING OF ALLAHABAD BENCH 05/2018
ATTENDENCE-CUM-ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING OF ALLAHABAD BENCH
OF THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL ON 07.02.2018
NAME OF THE COMPANY: IDBI BANK LID. LTD. LTD. SECTION OF THE COMPANIES ACT/I & B CODE: \$2.12(2) & (3) of I & B Code, 2016
SECTION OF THE COMPANIES ACT/I & B CODE: \$2.12(2) \$ (3) \$7 12 0

SL. N	O. Name	Designation	Representation	Signature
1.	MR. SUMANT E	BATRA ADVOCATE)	
2.	MR. ABHISHE	TK ANAND ADVOCE	CATE & FOR RP	peterner
3.	Ms. HONEY	SATPAL APVO	CATE	
4.	MR. ANUS	IAIN, RESOLUT PROFESSIO	NAL	.0
5.	R.P. Agams	- Adv	JAL	Cory no
6	R.P. Agmmi Bradeef Style,	schooling Chc	antal	Pordal

CP NO.(IB)77/ALD/2017, CA NO.5/2018

Sh. Sumant Batra, Advocate alongwith Sh. Abhishek Anand & Ms. Honey Satpal, Advocates for Resolution Professional (RP) Mr. Anuj Jain, present in person. Sh. Pradeep Singh Sisodia, CGSC for the Central Government. Sh. R.P. Agarwal, Advocate make appearance from Intervener Jai Prakash Associates Ltd.

Today, the Ld. RP moves the present application U/s 12(2) & (3) of the I & B Code, 2016 read with Regulation 40 of IBBI [Code under Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP)] Regulation, 2016 and Rule 11 of the NCLT Rules, 2016, for seeking extension of time of CIRP for a further period of 90 days beyond 180 days, which is now going to be over on 12.02.2018.

Intervener, being a holding company of the company under CIRP has raised an issue on the interpretation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's order dated 11.09.2017, whereby it has pleased to issue further direction by modifying of its earlier order dated 04.09.2017. It is contended that modification of the Hon'ble Supreme Court's order dated 04.09.2017 cannot be treated vacating or recalling of the stay as granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 04.09.2017 in the present matter against order

v

become *functions officio* and not to proceed further in the matter till the continuance of the stay or unless the RP obtains a specific permission from the Supreme Court to move the present application for seeking extension of his term of RP and period of the CIRP, because the status of the RP as now is an appointee of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as order dated 04.09.2017 which passed under Article 142 of the Constitution of India and not necessarily under the provision of the I & B Code.

We have heard the submission of learned counsel for both the parties at length, Sh. Pradeep Singh Sisodia, CGSC appearing for Central Govt. would submit that he is not in receipt of any instruction from Central Govt. to offer any comment. Further, he is of the view that in respect of the present application, there appears no specific role of the Central Govt. for deciding such application.

However, Sh. Sumant Batra, Ld. Advocate for the petitioner/RP would submit that the third party has no locus standi to agitate such issue before this Court and the appointment of RP has been made by this Court being an Adjudicating Authority under the provision of the I & B Code. Since, his appointment has now been restored by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by directing him to take over the management of the Corporate Debtor Company. Hence, the present application for extension of his term as well as period for CIRP would lie before this Court being an Adjudicating Authority under the Code and being original Court. Further any order passed by this Court shall always be subject to further directions/order to be passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Hence, this Court may pass an appropriate order in the present application.

Arguments on behalf of learned counsel for both the parties are heard. Since, the matter is subjudiced in the Supreme Court, parties concern is advised to appraise of the Hon'ble Supreme Court about the filing of the present petition.

The matter to be listed on 12th February, 2018 afternoon session.

Dated:07.02.2018

Typed by: Kavya Prakash Srivastava (Stenographer) H.P. Chaturvedi, Member (Judicial)