



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2024
PRESENT**

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE H.B.PRABHAKARA SASTRY

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE RAMACHANDRA D. HUDDAR

MISCELLANEOUS FIRST APPEAL NO. 5404 OF 2023 (KPIDFA)

BETWEEN:

MR. ALLA BAKASH
SON OF MR. KASIM,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
NO.33, M K HOUSE, II CROSS,
4TH MAIN ROAD,
RAHMATH NAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 032.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. KHAMROZ KHAN S R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE COMPETANT AUTHORITY
FOR M/S AMBIDENT MARKETING PRIVATE LIMITED,
3RD FLOOR, MINI, V.V. TOWER,
PODIUM BLOCK,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001,
REP BY ITS COMPETENT AUTHORITY,
DR ASHOK D R JOINT SECRETARY,
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS.
2. M/S AMBIDENT MARKETING PRIVATE LIMITED
REGD. OFFICE AT NO.9 A KHB MAIN ROAD,
KANAKANAGARA,
R T NAGAR POST,
BENGALURU-560 032,
(REGISTERED VIDE NO.CIN U74999KA2016PTC9812



BY ROC KORAMANGALA, BENGALURU.
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR,
MR. SYED FAREED AHMED,
SON OF D.A.JALALUDDIN
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO. 374,
KUSHAL NAGAR OPPOSITE HANIFIYA MASJID,
VENKATESHAPURAM,
BENGALURU-560 045.

...RESPONDENTS

THIS MISCELLANEOUS FIRST APPEAL IS FILED U/S.16 OF THE KARNATAKA PROTECTION OF INTEREST OF DEPOSITORS IN FINANCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS ACT, AGAINST THE ORDER DT.30.06.2023 PASSED IN MISC.NO.1359/2022 ON THE FILE OF THE XCI ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE, AND SPECIAL JUDGE FOR KPIDFE CASES, BENGALURU, (CCH-92), ALLOWING THE PETITIONS FILED U/S.5(2) OF THE KPIDFE ACT,2004.

THIS MISCELLANEOUS FIRST APPEAL, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, **RAMACHANDRA D. HUDDAR J.**, MADE THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER

Called again in the afternoon session.

None appears for the appellant either physically or through video conference, even at 2.30 p.m. Office objections are not complied.

2. Perused the order sheet of this appeal. Though sufficient opportunity is given to the appellant to comply with the office objections, the appellant has not complied



the office objections. There are no justifiable reasons to grant further time to comply office objections. The appellant was granted six adjournments to comply with the office objections, therefore, the appeal is dismissed for non-compliance of office objections and non-prosecution.

**Sd/-
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
JUDGE**

PSJ
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 3