

**NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL  
JAIPUR BENCH**  
*(through web-based video conferencing platform)*

Item No. 108  
CA No. 9/JPR/2026  
CP No. 195/241(1)/JPR/2019  
Under Section 241(1) of  
Companies Act, 2013

**In the matter of:**

**Mr. Shanti Lal Maroo**

...Petitioner

**Versus**

**M/s American International Health Management Ltd. & Ors.**

...Respondents

**Coram: HON'BLE MS. REETA KOHLI, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**HON'BLE MS. KAVITA BHATNAGAR, TECHNICAL MEMBER**

**PRESENT: -**

For the Applicant

: Amol Vyas, Adv.  
Prabhansh Sharma, Adv.  
Nagendra Singh Adha, Adv.  
Siddharth Chalavarya, Adv.  
Rohini, Adv.  
Abhishek Rajpurohit, Adv.

**ORDER**

**CA No. 9/JPR/2026:-**

At the outset, the counsel for the applicant states that there is a typographical mistake in the prayer made. The EOGM notice dated 15.06.2026 be read as 15.05.2026 as is evident from Annexure-1 at page No. 21. The present application has been preferred by the applicant-petitioner for seeking the stay on the operation & implementation and also the effect of EOGM notice dated 15.05.2026. While advancing his contentions, Ld. Counsel has drawn our attention to the order dated 29.11.2019 vide which this Adjudicating Authority was pleased to direct the applicant to make an application to respondent company for inspection of the record as sought by him within three days and the

Sdr

Sdr

Respondents to consider the same favourably. The contention of the counsel is that despite the application made the respondents failed to allow inspection to the applicant. He further states that the applicant was compelled to file a contempt petition against the respondent. Ultimately vide order dated 14.05.2026, the statement of the respondent present in person was recorded in Court during the course of the proceedings wherein the respondent was pleased to allow the inspection to the petitioner if he makes an application. The counsel states that before they could actually inspect the record, the impugned notice dated 15.05.2026 was received for conducting the EOGM on a short notice along with the draft resolution. The contention of the counsel is that the perusal of the draft resolution and also the explanatory statement does not make out any case of urgency requiring the company to issue short notice. The EOGM should thus be made comply with the statutory provision of 21 days. In addition, the Counsel further states that vide order dated 06.04.2021, the Hon'ble court was pleased to direct that if any Board Meeting is held by the respondent-company, a notice thereof shall be provided to the applicant. The Counsel submits that before issuance of the notice dated 15.05.2026 for holding the EOGM, presumption is that a Board Meeting has been held but no such notice of scheduling or holding the Board meeting was forwarded to the applicant. This itself shows the blatant defiance to the directions of this Hon'ble Court by the respondents. Keeping in view the above stated contentions of the Ld. Counsel for the applicant, we deem it appropriate to issue notice to the respondents.

Sd

Sdr

**Notice of Motion:** - Registry as well as Petitioner/Applicant are directed to serve the notice to the Respondents and to submit service report along with copy sent to Respondents, postal receipt, track/acknowledgment before the next date of hearing. Upon service, the Respondents are directed to file the reply, before the next date of hearing by serving an advance copy to the counsel opposite.

Keeping in view the fact that the case is already posted for 21.05.2026, we deem it appropriate to direct the respondents not to take any action on the resolution if any passed in the meeting scheduled for 18.05.2026. Posted for 21.05.2026. Reply if any be filed before the next date of hearing.



(Kavita Bhatnagar)  
Technical Member  
May 18, 2026



(Reeta Kohli)  
Judicial Member