

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Restoration Application (AT) No. 25 of 2026

in
Comp. App. (AT) No. 12 of 2024

IN THE MATTER OF:

CA Apoorve Bansal

...Appellant(s)

Versus

National Financial Reporting Authority (NFRA)

...Respondent(s)

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. Tarun Verma, Advocate.

For Respondents : Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Satyam, Ms. Tanvi Jain, Advocates.

ORDER
(Hybrid Mode)

13.07.2026: **Restoration App. (AT) No. 25 of 2026-** Heard Mr. Tarun Verma, Ld. Counsel for the Applicant. Shri Zoheb Hossain, Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing for NFRA. Perused the record.

The instant application has been moved with the prayer to restore CA (AT) No. 12 of 2024 to its original number for the reasons given in the application.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant before this Appellate Tribunal was diligently contesting the appeal however on some dates, though the appeal was adjourned for want of time, however the appearance could not be marked by Ld. Counsel for the Appellant and on the day when the order dated 06.04.2026 was passed the arguing Sr. Counsel has instructed the Counsel for the appellant to take an adjournment however due to some technical glitch in the system he cannot

access the VC Portal and in result the appeal was dismissed, noticing that the appellant is not represented by anyone.

Ld. Counsel appearing for the NFRA however submits that the appellant was not diligently pursuing his appeal and therefore the Restoration Application be dismissed as no sufficient reason has been given therein for non-appearance of the Counsel for the appellant on 06.04.2026.

We have perused the record in the background of submissions made by Ld. Counsel for the parties and find substance in the submission made Ld. Counsel for the applicant/appellant that on some of the dates which has been mentioned in the order dated 06.04.2026 whereon the appeal was dismissed, the appeal could not be taken up due to paucity of time, however the Ld. Counsel for the appellant failed to mark his presence.

Having regard to the submissions made by Ld. Counsel for the appellant that he will now onwards pursue the appeal diligently, and keeping in view the explanation given in the restoration application, we find that the non-appearance of Ld. Counsel for the appellant on 06.04.2026 has been sufficiently explained.

Thus for the reasons given aforesaid the application is allowed and the CA (AT) No. 12 of 2024 is restored to its original number.

As requested by Ld. Counsel for the appellant, list this appeal on **29.07.2026** under the caption 'For Hearing'.

It is stipulated that no adjournment on that date would be granted to the appellant.

[Justice Mohammad Faiz Alam Khan]
Member (Judicial)

[Naresh Salecha]
Member (Technical)

sr/mr