NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1270 of 2026
& I.A. No.4837 of 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

Ebix Singapore Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. **...Appellant(s)**

Versus

State Bank of India **...Respondent(s)**

Present:

For Appellant(s) : **Mr. Mohit Nandwani, Mr. Om Gulati, Ms. Akanksha Mehta, Ms. Aditi Yadav, Advocates.**

For Respondent(s) : **Ms. Ekta Choudhary, Mr. Shirish Parashar, Advocates.**

O R D E R
(Hybrid Mode)

16.10.2026: **I.A. No.4837 of 2026:** We have heard learned counsel for the Appellant/ Applicant as well as learned counsel for the State Bank of India - Sole Respondent and perused the record.

2. The instant application has been moved by the Appellant to condone the delay of 71 days which has occurred in refiling the appeal. Learned counsel for the Appellant submits that the delay of 71 days in removing the defects, indicated by the Registry, has occurred due to the circumstances which were not under the control of the Appellant.

3. While drawing our attention towards Para 6 of the Affidavit filed by the Appellant on 19.09.2026, it is submitted that the defects were initially raised by the Registry in the month of June and there were summer vacation in the NCLAT and the Appellant No.2 whose signature and instruction were required

Cont'd.../

for removing the defects was diagnosed with oral cancer and had undergone many investigations which kept him disturbed physically and mentally and therefore, delay in removing the defects was occurred.

4. Learned counsel for the Appellant has also drawn our attention to various documentary evidences with regard to ailment of Appellant No.2 enclosed with the Application.

5. Learned counsel for the Respondent opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the Appellant and submits that the delay of 71 days has not been sufficiently explained, therefore, the application is liable to be rejected.

6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. We notice that in the affidavit filed later on by the Appellant in its quest to explain the delay, the medical investigation reports pertaining to Appellant No.2 are enclosed, which prima facie suggest that the Appellant No.2 was diagnosed with some malignancy and was being treated for the same during the said period. We also notice that defence has been taken by the Appellant that the defects were required to be removed on the instructions of the Appellant No.2 and therefore, as the Appellant No.2 was mentally and physically disturbed, the defects could not be removed within the time indicated by the Registry.

8. Having considered all facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the considered view that the delay of 71 days which is occurred in refiling the

appeal has been adequately explained. Thus, the application filed by the Appellant for condonation of delay is allowed and delay of 71 days which has occurred in refiling the appeal is condoned. I.A. No.4837 of 2026 is disposed of.

Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1270 of 2026

Having heard learned counsel for the Appellant, we are of the considered opinion that the matter requires consideration.

2. Issue notice to the Respondent.

3. Notice on behalf of Respondent has been received by Ms. Ekta Choudhary, she prays for and is granted two weeks' time to file reply with an advance copy to learned counsel for the Appellant, who in turn, if so with may file rejoinder within one week thereafter.

4. List this appeal on **30.11.2026** under caption 'For admission (after notice)'.

[Justice Mohammad Faiz Alam Khan]
Member (Judicial)

[Arun Baroka]
Member (Technical)

Archana/km