

**NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL**  
**NEW DELHI BENCH**  
**NEW DELHI**

C. P. NO. 108(ND)09  
CA. NO.

PRESENT: SMT. INA MALHOTRA  
Hon'ble Member (J)

**ATTENDANCE-CUM-ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING OF NEW DELHI BENCH OF  
THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL ON 08.09.2016**

**NAME OF THE COMPANY:** Sharad Aggarwal & Ors V/s. Rajesh Buildcon & Infrass. Pvt. Ltd.

**SECTION OF THE COMPANIES ACT:** 397/398


S.NO.	NAME	DESIGNATION	REPRESENTATION	SIGNATURE
1.	Sangeam Patnaik, Adv	}	R 1-5	<u>Telma</u>
2.	Ms. Tehsina, Adv			
3.	ACHISH AGGARWAL Adv		Resp 6 to 22	} HKaur
4.	HARLEEN NAUR Adv			
5.	SANJAY MISHRA Adv.		Resp. 23-	Sanjay M
6.	VIVEK SINGH, Adv	}	For <del>Resp</del> Petitioner	<u>Masana</u> <u>IndeR</u>
7.	UPASANA TALWAR Adv,			
8.	IndeR Raj Gupta			

P.T.O →

## ORDER

Arguments in CP 48(ND)2008 part heard.

2. This Bench is apprised of the fact that previously an MoU had been suggested in July, 2011, which is on page 88 of the rejoinder to the reply filed by the Respondents 32 to 36. In terms thereof, it had been proposed that the petitioner in this case along with Respondents 1, 9 to 12 would take the Haridwar parcel of land and a small portion of the land at Jaipur. The rest of Jaipur land would be taken by the other parties to the lis. Let the same be reconsidered by the parties.
3. In principle, it is submitted by the Ld. Counsels that this would be acceptable to the parties. However, Mr. Chandrasekhar Yadav, counsel for Respondent Mr. Inder Raj prays for some time to take necessary instructions.
4. If agreeable a compromise application along with a fresh MoU be filed.
5. To come up on 19.09.2016.

  
(Ina Malhotra)  
Member Judicial