NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1247 of 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

Intarvo Technologies Pvt. Ltd. ...Appellant(s)

Versus

Vivek Jairath & Anr. ...Respondent(s)

Present:

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Krishnendu Datta, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Aditi Sharma, Ms. Navya Sharma, Advocates.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Vipin Garg, Ms. Anshita Girdhar, Mr. Abhishek Aggarwal, Advocates for R-1.

Mr. Suraj Sharma, Advocate for R-2 (RP).

With

Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1277 of 2025
& I.A. No. 5002 of 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

Sonoma Management Partners Pvt. Ltd. ...Appellant(s)

Versus

Intarvo Technologies Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. ...Respondent(s)

Present:

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Milan Singh Negi, Mr. Nikhil Kumar Jha, Ms. Katyayani, Advocates.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Krishnendu Datta, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Aditi Sharma, Ms. Navya Sharma, Advocates for R-1.

Mr. Vipin Garg, Ms. Anshita Girdhar, Mr. Abhishek Aggarwal, Advocates for R-2.

Mr. Suraj Sharma, Advocate for R-3 (RP).

O R D E R
(Hybrid Mode)

15.10.2026: In Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1247 of 2025, Mr. Vipin Garg is representing Respondent No.1, Mr. Suraj Sharma represents

Cont'd.../

Respondent No.2 while in Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1277 of 2025, Respondent No.1 is represented by Mr. Krishnendu Datta, learned senior counsel, Respondent No.2 is represented by Mr. Vipin Garg and Respondent No.3 is represented by Mr. Suraj Sharma.

2. All the respondents in the aforesaid appeals fairly submits that there is no exigency emerging in these appeals to file their reply and they will argue the appeal on the material which has already been brought on record in the appeals by Appellants.

3. In this scenario, we are hearing these appeals finally.

4. We have heard Shri Krishnendu Datta, learned senior counsel for the Appellant in Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1247 of 2025 and Shri Milan Singh Negi, learned counsel for the Appellant in Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1277 of 2025 as well as Shri Vipin Garg, learned counsel for Vivek Jairath and Shri Suraj Sharma, learned counsel for the Resolution Professional and perused the record. Arguments concluded.

5. **Judgment reserved**.

6. Learned counsel for the parties may file their written submissions not containing more than 3-4 pages within 7 days from today.

7. We also record the statement given by Shri Vipin Garg appearing for the Respondent – Vivek Jairath that as the claim of the Respondent – Vivek Jairath is being considered by the SRA, they are not having any objection if this appeal is allowed.

8. We also put to record statement made by Shri Suraj Sharma, learned counsel for the RP that he is not having any objection if this appeal is allowed.

9. However, as requested, we have granted permission to both the Respondents also to filed their written submission.

10. We direct the learned counsel for the RP to bring on record the status of the Corporate Debtor as is reflected in the records of the ROC.

11. We further direct the Appellant to file along with his written submission, an affidavit by the Appellant disclosing clearly all the creditors and the amount outstanding against them.

[Justice Mohammad Faiz Alam Khan]
Member (Judicial)

[Arun Baroka]
Member (Technical)

Archana/km