

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Comp. App. (AT) (Ins) No. 1258 of 2026

&

I.A. No. 4866 of 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

VR India Security Services Pvt. Ltd.

...Appellant(s)

Versus

Anju Agarwal and Ors.

...Respondent(s)

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. Nilotpall Shyam, Mr. Keshri Kumar, Mr. Pramod Goyal, Advocates.

For Respondents : Ms. Shipra, Ms. Himanshi Chandani, Advocates for R-1.

O R D E R
(Hybrid Mode)

14.08.2026: **IA No. 4866 of 2026**- Heard Ld. Counsel for the Appellant and Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 1. The instant application has been filed by the appellant to condone the delay of 13 days' which has occurred in preferring the appeal.

The Respondent No. 1 to 4 have already been served. However, they neither appeared nor file any objections so far as the delay condonation application is concerned.

We have considered the explanation given by the appellant in paragraph no. 1 to 5 of the application and are of the view that the delay of 13 days which has occurred in filing the appeal has been sufficiently explained.

In view of above we allow the application and condone the delay of 13 days which has occurred in preferring the appeal.

CA (AT) (Ins) No. 1258 of 2026- Ld. Counsel for the Appellant submits that he has filed the affidavit of service however admits that the hard copy of the same has not been filed. As requested four days' time is granted for the purpose of bringing on record the hard copy of the affidavit of service.

Mr. Nilotpal Shyam, Ld. Counsel for the Appellant is present and no one is present for the Respondents.

We notice that the office has submitted a report to the effect that the Respondent No. 1 to 4 have been duly served and Ld. Counsel for the Appellant has also indicated that he has filed the affidavit of service online however the hard copy of the same could not be filed. We accordingly permit Ld. Counsel for the Appellant to bring on record the hard copy of the affidavit of service which he has filed online.

Having regard to the report submitted by the Registry and having perused the material available on record with regard to the sending of notices through the speed post and having regard to the affidavit of service filed by the appellant the Respondent No. 1 to 4 appears to have been sufficiently served.

At this juncture, Ms. Shipra, has appeared through VC and informed that she will be representing the Respondent No. 1. She prays for and is granted two weeks' time to file reply with an advance copy to Ld. Counsel for the Appellant who in turn if so wish may also file rejoinder within one week thereafter.

We at the outset has also asked Ld. Counsel for the Appellant as to whether the AR of creditors in class i.e. homebuyers/allottees and the

monitoring committee has been arrayed as a party and he submits that he will implead the same as Respondent No. 5 and 6. We accordingly permit Ld. Counsel for the Appellant to submit amended memo of parties within three days from today.

We further provide that after the submission of the amended memo of parties the notice shall be issued by the Registry to Respondent No. 3 and newly impleaded Respondents No. 5 and 6. Steps along with process fee as well as requisites be taken within reasonable time.

List on **07.09.2026** under the caption 'For Admission (After Notice)'.

Ld. Counsel for the Appellant also requested for grant of interim relief however in our considered opinion the same could only be considered after providing an opportunity of being heard to the Respondents, especially those Respondents which have not been arrayed as party before us.

[Justice Mohammad Faiz Alam Khan]
Member (Judicial)

[Naresh Salecha]
Member (Technical)

sr/mr