

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Comp. App. (AT) No. 234 of 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

C P World Lines Pvt. Ltd. & Anr.

...Appellant(s)

Versus

Dr. Preet Anand & Ors.

...Respondent(s)

Present:

For Appellant(s) : Mr. P. Nagesh, Sr. Advocate with Adv. Samdarshi Sanjay, Mr. S.K. Sharma, Ms. Monika Sharma and Mr. Ashish Kumar Sharma, Advocates.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Kumar Mihir, Mr. Anurag Chandra, Mr. Rohit Raman, Ms. Sweta Shree and Mr. Piyush Singh, Advocates for R1 and R2.

Mr. S.K. Sharma, Mr. Bharat Upreti and Mr. Vyom S., Advocates for R3.

With

Comp. App. (AT) No. 235 of 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

C P World Lines Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.

...Appellant(s)

Versus

Dr. Preet Anand & Ors.

...Respondent(s)

Present:

For Appellant(s) : Mr. P. Nagesh, Sr. Advocate with Adv. Samdarshi Sanjay, Mr. S.K. Sharma, Ms. Monika Sharma and Mr. Ashish Kumar Sharma, Advocates.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Kumar Mihir, Mr. Anurag Chandra, Mr. Rohit Raman, Ms. Sweta Shree and Mr. Piyush Singh, Advocates for R1 and R2.

Mr. S.K. Sharma, Mr. Bharat Upreti and Mr. Vyom S., Advocates for R3.

O R D E R
(Hybrid Mode)

24.06.2026 **CA(AT) No.234 of 2026:**

The notice of the Appeal has been received by Mr. Kumar Mihir on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and Respondent No.2.

2. Shri P. Nagesh, Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing for the Appellant submits that the Ld. Tribunal, by passing the impugned order, has placed an Administrator to look after the affairs of the Company where there was no final prayer made for the same in the Company Petition filed by the Respondent No.1 and Respondent No.2.

3. It is further submitted that in the impugned order no reason has been given which may justify the appointment of the Administrator. It is next submitted that the nature of the business of the Company is such that the appointment of the Administrator may result in the cancellation of various contracts of the Company and since the Administrator may not have any expertise, the day to day business of the Company may also not be performed by the Administrator. It is further submitted that the grievance of Respondent No.1 and Respondent No.2 was with regard to the appointment of a Director by Appellant No.2 and thus the Tribunal should not have travelled beyond the dispute stated in the petition.

4. Ld. Counsel appearing for the Respondent No.1 and Respondent No.2, however, submits that the Company could not file the Appeal through Appellant No.2, as the affairs of the Company had been taken over by the Administrator appointed by the impugned order.

5. It is further submitted that the grievance of the Appellant No.2 is also not genuine, as apart from being a Director of the Company, he is also the CEO of the Company and his status as CEO has not been affected by the impugned order.

6. It is further submitted that the Respondent be given reasonable time to file their reply.

7. We have heard Ld. Counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. By passing the impugned order, the Tribunal has appointed Mr. Indresh Upadhyay as an Administrator on the Board of Directors of the Company with a further direction to take charge by all necessary means and carry out the day to day affairs of the Company for a period of 90 days from the date of passing of the order.

9. It is reflected that the Authority which has been given to the Ld. Administrator is to carry out the day to day affairs of the Company. The grievance of the Company appears to be that, having regard to the nature of business of the Appellant, the Administrator, who does not have any expertise in the field, may not be in a position to carry out the day to day affairs of the Company alone and taking over charge of the Company by Administrator may result in losing various contracts of the Company and the financial condition of the Company would also be adversely affected.

10. Having considered the submissions of Ld. Counsel for the parties and in view of all the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the submission made by the Ld. Sr. Counsel for the Appellant, we are of the considered view that the grievance of the Appellant would be redressed if the

impugned order is modified in terms that the Administrator so appointed by the impugned order would remain so and would also take charge as directed; however, he will carry out the day to day business of the Company in consultation with the existing directors of the Company.

11. Let notice be issued to Respondent No.3 to Respondent No.6. Steps along with requisites be taken within 4 working days from today.

12. Two weeks' time shall be available to the Respondents, including Respondent No.1 and Respondent No.2 who are represented before us, to file the reply with an advance copy to the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant, who, if so advised, may also file rejoinder within a week thereafter.

13. List this Appeal on **20.07.2026**.

14. It is provided that till the next date of listing the Ld. Administrator so appointed by the impugned order would remain as such and would also take charge as directed by Ld. NCLT, but he will carry out the day to day business of the Company in due consultation with the existing directors of the Company. To this extent the impugned order is modified.

CA(AT) No. 235 of 2026:

Heard Ld. Counsel for the Appellant as well as Shri Kumar Mihir, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No.1 and Respondent No.2 , perused the record.

2. Issue Notice to the Respondent No.3 and Respondent No.4.

3. Steps along with requisites be taken within 4 working days from today.

4. Two weeks' time shall be available to the Respondents, including Respondent No.1 and Respondent No.2 to file reply with an advance copy to

the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant, who, if so advised, may file a rejoinder within a week thereafter.

5. List this Appeal on **20.07.2026**.

[Justice Mohammad Faiz Alam Khan]
Member (Judicial)

[Barun Mitra]
Member (Technical)

Abhishek/Rafi