IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL MUMBAI - BENCH-II

Company Petition No. 120/MB/2024

[Under Section 441 read with Section 96 and Section 99 of the Companies Act, 2013]

Ordered on: 16.07.2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

TRANSAUTO AND MECHAIDS PRIVATE LIMITED
[CIN:U99999MH1975PTC018139]
Plot No.292, Road No. 16,
Wagale Estate, Thane-400604.

MR. JASRAJ BHAGWANDAS GOYAL.
8-A, Ganga Jamnuna. 17 TH Road,
Santacruz West, Mumbai – 400054.

MR. RAJIV KUMAR MALHOTRA.
Villa 10, Grant Hyatt Residence Oud
Metha Road, Dubai, United Arab Emirates,
Dubai, 7167, United Arab Emirates.

... Applicants

Vs.

Registrar of Companies, Mumbai
100, Everest, Marine Drive, Mumbai 400002

… Respondents

CORAM:
HON’BLE SHRI ASHISH KALIA, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)
HON’BLE SHRI SANJIV DUTT, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

Appearances: Hybrid
For Petitioner : Adv. Hussain Dholkawala
For Respondent : A.K. Singh, Assist. RoC, Mumbai

ORDER

[Per: Coram]

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 This Petition bearing CP No. 120/MB/2024 has been filed by Transauto And Mechaids Private Limited along with its directors namely Mr. Jasraj Bhagwandas Goyal and Mr. Rajiv Kumar Malhotra (hereinafter collectively referred to as "the Applicants") on 26.04.2026, seeking compounding of the default committed by the Petitioners under Section 166 of the Companies Act, 1956 and Section 96 of the Companies Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), wherein it was found that the Directors of the Petitioner Company had failed to hold the Annual General Meetings ("AGM") for the Financial Years 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 within the prescribed time limit, thereby committing an offence punishable under Section 168 of the Companies Act, 1956 and Section 99 of the Companies Act, 2013.

2. CONTENTIONS OF PETITIONERS

2.1 The Petitioner Company, namely, Transauto and Mechaids Private Limited was incorporated on 14.02.1975 and is engaged in the business of manufacturing, fabrication, moulding, assembling, supplying, distribution and dealing in auto side-cars, auto aids, accessories and spares, auto body building and mechanical engineering goods, gadgets, aids, accessories and spares and also acts as technical consultants in India and abroad for automobile and mechanical engineering industries. The Corporate Identification Number (CIN) of the Petitioner Company is U99999MH1975PTC018139 and its registered office is situated at Plot No. 292, Road No. 16, Wagale Estate, Thane – 400604, Maharashtra.

2.2 It is submitted that Applicant No. 2, Mr. Jasraj Bhagwandas Goyal, was appointed as Director of the Petitioner Company on 31.10.2012 and resigned from the office of Director on 06.07.2019. It is further submitted that Applicant No. 3, Mr. Rajiv Kumar Malhotra, was appointed as Director of the Petitioner Company on 31.10.2012 and resigned on 30.09.2018. Thereafter, Applicant No. 3 was re-appointed as Director on 31.12.2019 and continues to be Director of the Petitioner Company.

2.3 Pursuant to the provisions of Section 96 of the Act, every company is required to hold its Annual General Meeting within the prescribed period and not more than fifteen months shall elapse between two Annual General Meetings. However, due to unavoidable circumstances and reasons beyond the control of the Petitioners, the AGMs for the Financial Years ended on 31.03.2012, 31.03.2013, 31.03.2014, 31.03.2015, 31.03.2016 and 31.03.2017 could not be held within the prescribed timelines.

2.4 It is further submitted that the delay in conducting the AGMs was inter alia due to disputes and litigation amongst the shareholders and management of the Petitioner Company. Around January 2012, the majority shareholder Mr. Rajinder Kumar Malhotra sensed mismanagement and oppression in the affairs of the Petitioner Company and its subsidiary companies. It was alleged that certain employee directors had turned hostile towards the Company and were acting against the interest of the Company and its shareholders.

2.5 It is submitted that in February 2012, Company Petitions were filed before the Hon'ble Company Law Board (CLB) under Sections 397, 398 and 402 of the Companies Act, 1956 alleging oppression and mismanagement against the directors of the Petitioner Company and its subsidiaries. Owing to the pendency of various litigations before different judicial for a including the Hon'ble CLB, Hon'ble Bombay High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the Petitioner Company was unable to finalise its financial statements and conduct the AGMs within the prescribed period under Section 96 of the Act.

2.6 It is further submitted that despite favourable orders passed by the Hon'ble Bombay High Court and the Hon'ble CLB, the erstwhile directors did not hand over the records and affairs of the Petitioner Company to the newly appointed Board of Directors. Thereafter, the newly appointed Directors took steps to streamline the affairs of the Petitioner Company and prepared the financial statements on the basis of information and records available to them.

2.7 The Ld. Counsel for the Petitioners submits that the financial statements for the Financial Years 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 were ultimately finalised and approved and the AGMs were conducted belatedly on 15.04.2015, 29.08.2015, 31.08.2015, 08.12.2017, 24.01.2018 and 16.03.2018 respectively. The details of delay are as follows:

Financial Year	Due Date of holding AGM	Date of actual AGM	Whether Default made good	Number of days Delay
2011-12	30.09.2012	15.04.2015	Yes	926 days
2012-13	30.09.2013	29.08.2015	Yes	697 days
2013-14	30.09.2014	31.08.2015	Yes	334 days
2014-15	30.09.2015	08.12.2017	Yes	799 days
2015-16	30.09.2016	24.01.2018	Yes	480 days
2016-17	30.09.2017	16.03.2018	Yes	166 days

2.8 It is submitted that the Petitioners have already made good the aforesaid defaults by conducting the AGMs and filing the Annual Returns and Financial

Statements with the Registrar of Companies along with the requisite challans and forms.

2.9 That the delay in holding the AGMs occurred due to circumstances beyond the control of the Petitioners and there was no *mala fide* intention on the part of the Petitioners. It is submitted that the alleged default neither prejudiced the interest of the shareholders, creditors or any other stakeholders nor adversely affected public interest.

2.10 It is further submitted that the shareholders of the Petitioner Company have not raised any objection in respect of the delay in conducting the AGMs and that the Petitioners have voluntarily approached this Tribunal by filing the present *Suo-moto* Compounding Application under Section 441 read with Section 166 and Section 96 of the Act.

2.11 In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the Petitioners have prayed for compounding of the offences committed under Section 166 and Section 96 of the Act, for the Financial Years ended on 31.03.2012, 31.03.2013, 31.03.2014, 31.03.2015, 31.03.2016 and 31.03.2017 under Section 441 of the Act and for allowing the present Compounding Application.

3 CONTENTIONS OF RESPONDENT/RoC

3.1 The Registrar of Companies, Mumbai/Respondent submits that the Petitioner Company has defaulted in complying with the provisions of Section 96 of the Act, by not conducting its AGMs within the prescribed time for the Financial Years 2011-12 to 2016-17. The details of delay are as follows:

Financial Year	Due Date of holding AGM	Date of actual AGM	Number of days' delay
2011-12	30.09.2012	15.04.2015	926 days

2012-13	30.09.2013	29.08.2015	667 days
2013-14	30.09.2014	31.08.2015	334 days
2014-15	30.09.2015	08.12.2017	799 days
2015-16	30.09.2016	24.01.2018	480 days
2016-17	30.09.2017	16.03.2018	166 days

3.2 The Respondent further submits that the aforesaid offences are punishable under Section 99 of the Act, and accordingly the Petitioner Company and its directors are liable to pay fine for the continuing defaults as prescribed under the Act.

3.3 The Respondent has placed on record the penalty calculation sheets in respect of Applicant No.1, Applicant No.2 and Applicant No.3, wherein the maximum penalty amount calculated for the defaults pertaining to the Financial Years ended on 31.03.2012 to 31.03.2017 for each Applicant is as follows:

Financial Year	**Company (Applicant No.1)**	**Rajiv Kumar Rajinder Kumar Malhotra (Director) (Applicant No.2)**	**Jasraj Bhagwandas Goyal (Director) (Applicant No.3)**	**TOTAL PENALTY**
2011-2012	Rs.23,62,500/- (Rs.50,000+ Rs.2500*925 days)	Rs.3,55,000/- (Rs.50,000+ Rs.2500*122 days)	Rs.3,55,000/- (Rs.50,000+ Rs.2500*122 days)	Rs.30,72,500/-
2012-2013	Rs.71,70,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*697days)	Rs.71,70,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*697days)	Rs.71,70,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*697days)	Rs.2,15,10,000/-
2013-2014	Rs.5,40,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*334 days)	Rs.5,40,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*334 days)	Rs.5,40,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*334 days)	Rs.16,20,000/-
2014-2015	Rs.81,90,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*799 days)	Rs.81,90,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*799 days)	Rs.81,90,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*799 days)	Rs.2,45,70,000/-

2015-2016	Rs.50,00,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*480 days)	Rs.50,00,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*480 days)	Rs.50,00,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*480 days)	Rs.1,50,00,000/-
2016-2017	Rs.18,60,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*166 days)	Rs.18,60,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*166 days)	Rs.18,60,000/- (Rs.200,000+Rs.10000*166 days)	Rs.55,80,000/-

3.4 It is submitted by the Respondent that the defaults committed by the Petitioners are continuing in nature. However, the Petitioners have subsequently made good the defaults by convening the AGMs for the relevant financial years and filing the requisite statutory forms and annual filings with the RoC.

3.5 That the Petitioners have shown bona fide intention in rectifying the defaults and have voluntarily approached this Tribunal by filing the present Compounding Application under Section 441 of the Act.

3.6 The RoC has further submitted that during the period of default, the concerned Directors of the Petitioner Company were officers in default and were liable for non-compliance of the provisions of Section 96 of the Act.

3.7 In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the Respondent has left the matter to the discretion of this Tribunal for compounding of the offences committed by the Petitioners under Section 96 read with Section 441 of the Act.

4. ANALYISIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 We have heard the Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner and Representative of ROC/Respondent and perused the materials on record.

4.2 It is observed that Petitioner Company failed to convene its Annual General Meetings for the Financial Years 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 within the period prescribed under Section 166 of the Companies Act, 1956 and Section 96 of the Companies Act, 2013. Consequently, the

Petitioners became liable for penal consequences under Section 168 of the Companies Act, 1956 and Section 99 of the Companies Act, 2013. Further, considering that similar defaults were committed in successive financial years, the provisions of Section 451 of the Companies Act, 2013 are also attracted.

4.3 Section 168 of the Companies Act, 1956 provides that if default is made in holding a meeting of the company in accordance with Section 166, the company and every officer of the company who is in default shall be punishable with fine which may extend to Rupees Fifty Thousand and in case of continuing default, with a further fine which may extend to Rupees Two Thousand Five Hundred for every day during which such default continues. Further, Section 99 of the Companies Act, 2013 provides that if any default is made in holding a meeting of the company in accordance with Section 96, the company and every officer of the company who is in default shall be punishable with fine which may extend to Rupees One Lakh and in case of continuing default, with a further fine which may extend to Rupees Five Thousand for every day during which such default continues.

4.4 It is further relevant to note that Section 451 of the Companies Act, 2013 provides that where a company or officer commits the same offence for the second or subsequent occasions within a period of three years, such company and every officer in default shall be punishable with twice the amount of fine for such offence in addition to any imprisonment provided for that offence. Accordingly, the provisions of Section 451 become applicable in the present matter in relation to repeated defaults committed by the Petitioners in successive financial years.

4.5 That while considering a Compounding Application under Section 441 of the Act, this Tribunal is required to consider various factors including the gravity and nature of default, whether the default was intentional or inadvertent, whether the offence is continuing in nature, whether the default has been subsequently rectified, whether the application has been filed suo motu and whether the conduct of the applicants demonstrates bona fide intention in complying with the provisions of law.

4.6 It is observed that the delay in holding the AGM's occurred primarily due to serious disputes and litigation amongst the shareholders and management of the Petitioner Company. The record reveals that in or around January 2012, disputes arose between the shareholders and the then Board of Directors regarding allegations of oppression and mismanagement in the affairs of the Petitioner Company and its group companies. Consequently, proceedings under Sections 397 and 398 of the Companies Act, 1956 came to be instituted before the Hon'ble Company Law Board, Mumbai.

4.7 It is further observed from the records that multiple proceedings were thereafter initiated before the Hon'ble Company Law Board, Hon'ble Bombay High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India concerning reconstitution of the Board of Directors and control over the affairs of the Petitioner Company. The Hon'ble Company Law Board vide order dated 31.01.2013 permitted reconstitution of the Board, whereas subsequent appeals and proceedings continued before various judicial authorities.

4.8 Despite favourable orders passed by the Hon'ble Bombay High Court and the Hon'ble Company Law Board, the erstwhile hostile directors failed to hand over the charge, affairs and records of the Petitioner Company to the newly constituted Board of Directors. The newly appointed Directors thereafter made efforts to retrieve the records and streamline the affairs of the Petitioner

Company and ultimately prepared the financial statements on the basis of information available with them.

4.9 This Bench finds substance in the contention of the Petitioners that the delay in holding the AGM's occurred due to unavoidable circumstances arising from prolonged litigations, disputes amongst shareholders and non-cooperation of the erstwhile management and directors. The Petitioners have also categorically stated that there was no mala fide intention on their part and that the delay did not prejudice the interests of shareholders, creditors or public at large.

4.10 It is noticed from the record that the Petitioners have subsequently regularised the default by conducting the AGM's for all the aforesaid Financial Years by filing the requisite Annual Returns and Financial Statements with the RoC along with prescribed statutory forms and challans.

4.11 The present Compounding Application has been filed voluntarily by the Petitioners under Section 441 of the Act seeking compounding of the offence committed under Section 166 of the Companies Act, 1956 and Section 96 of the Companies Act, 2013 read with Section 168 of the Companies Act, 1956, Section 99 and Section 451 of the Companies Act, 2013. The Petitioners have also placed on record the Board Resolution dated 24.01.2024 authorising filing and prosecution of the present Application.

4.12 Since the offence under Section 168 of the Companies Act, 1956 and Section 99 of the Companies Act, 2013 is punishable with fine only, there exists no legal impediment in compounding the said offence under Section 441 of the Act. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, including the subsequent rectification of the default and the circumstances leading thereto, this Bench is of the considered view that the offences committed by the

Petitioners are fit to be compounded upon payment of compounding fees as may be determined by this Tribunal.

4.13 This Bench has gone through the pleadings on record and the submissions made by the Representative for the Applicants / Defaulters herein and is accordingly of the considered view that the Applicants/Defaulters herein have violated Section 166 of the Companies Act, 1956 and Section 96 of the Companies Act, 2013 and for the said violation, the punishment is provided under Section 168 of the Companies Act, 1956 and Section 99 of the Companies Act, 2013 respectively. Further, in view of repeated defaults for successive financial years, Section 451 of the Companies Act, 2013 is also attracted in the present case. The extracts of the Sections which are relevant in this case are as follows:

Section 168 of the Companies Act, 1956 –

Sec.168- If default is made in holding a meeting of the company in accordance with section 166, or in complying with any directions of the Tribunal or the Central Government, as the case may be under sub-section (1) of section 167, the company, and every officer of the company who is in default, shall be punishable with fine which may extend to fifty thousand rupees and in the case of a continuing default, with a further fine which may extend to two thousand five hundred rupees for every day after the first during which such default continues.

Section 99 of the Companies Act, 2013 applicable w.e.f. 01.06.2016.

"Section 99- If any default is made in holding a meeting of the company in accordance with section 96 or section 97 or section 98, or in complying with any directions of the Tribunal, the company, and every officer of the company who is in default shall be punishable with fine which may extend to one lakh rupees and

in the case of a continuing default, with a further fine which may extend to five thousand rupees for every day during which such default continues."

<u>Section 451 of the Companies Act, 2013 applicable w.e.f. 12.09.2013</u>

"451- If a company or an officer of a company commits an offence punishable either with fine or with imprisonment and where the same offence is committed for the second or subsequent occasions within a period of three years, then, that company and every officer thereof who is in default shall be punishable with twice the amount of fine for such offence in addition to any imprisonment provided for that offence."

4.14 Hence, the penalty u/s 168/99 of the 1956/2013 Act for the defaulters in respect of the default occurring in the financial years 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-2014, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 is computed in the table hereinbelow:

Penalty Calculation for Applicant No.1 (Company):-

Financial Year	**Applicable Section**	**Period of Default**	**Maximum Penalty proposed by RoC (Rs.)**	**Compounding Fee (Rs.)**
2011-12	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956	926 days	23,62,500/-	For One-time default **Rs.25,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- per day for 926 days amounting to **Rs.2,31,500/-.** **Total- Rs.2,56,500/-**
2012-13	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956	697 days	71,70,000/-	For One-time default **Rs.25,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- per day for 697

				days amounting to **Rs. 1,74,250/-.** **Total- Rs.1,99,250/-**
2013-14	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013.	334 days	33,40,000/-	For One-time default Rs.25000/- x 2 = **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- x 2 = Rs.500/- per day for 334 days amounting to **Rs.1,67,000/-.** **Total- Rs.2,17,000/-**
2014-15	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013.	799 days	79,90,000/-	For One-time default Rs.25000/- x 2 = **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- x 2 = Rs.500/- per day for 799 days amounting to **Rs.3,99,500/-.** **Total- Rs.4,49,500/-**
2015-16	Section 96 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013	480 days	48,00,000/-	For One-time default **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 500/- x 2 = Rs.1000/- per day for 480 days amounting to **Rs.4,80,000/-.** **Total- Rs.5,30,000/-**
2016-17	Section 96 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013	166 days	16,60,000/-	For One-time default **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 500/- x 2 = Rs.1000/- per

				day for 166 days amounting to **Rs 1,66,000/-.** **Total- Rs.2,16,000/-**

Penalty Calculation for Applicant No.2 (Director):-

Financial Year	**Applicable Section**	**Period of Default**	**Maximum Penalty proposed by RoC (Rs.)**	**Compounding Fee (Rs.)**
2011-12	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956	926 days	23,62,500/-	For One-time default **Rs.25,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- per day for 926 days amounting to **Rs.2,31,500/-.** **Total- Rs.2,56,500/-**
2012-13	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956	697 days	71,70,000/-	For One-time default **Rs.25,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- per day for 697 days amounting to **Rs. 1,74,250/-.** **Total- Rs.1,99,250/-**
2013-14	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013.	334 days	33,40,000/-	For One-time default Rs.25000/- x 2 = **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- x 2 = Rs.500/- per day for 334 days amounting to **Rs.1,67,000/-.**

				Total- Rs.2,17,000/-
2014-15	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013.	799 days	79,90,000/-	For One-time default Rs.25000/- x 2 = **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- x 2 = Rs.500/- per day for 799 days amounting to **Rs.3,99,500/-.** **Total- Rs.4,49,500/-**
2015-16	Section 96 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013	480 days	48,00,000/-	For One-time default **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 500/- x 2 = Rs.1000/- per day for 480 days amounting to **Rs.4,80,000/-.** **Total- Rs.5,30,000/-**
2016-17	Section 96 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013	166 days	16,60,000/-	For One-time default **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 500/- x 2 = Rs.1000/- per day for 166 days amounting to **Rs 1,66,000/-.** **Total- Rs.2,16,000/-**

Penalty Calculation for Applicant No.3 (Director):-

Financial Year	Applicable Section	Period of Default	Maximum Penalty proposed by RoC (Rs.)	Compounding Fee (Rs.)

2011-12	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956	926 days	23,62,500/-	For One-time default **Rs.25,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- per day for 926 days amounting to **Rs.2,31,500/-.** **Total- Rs.2,56,500/-**
2012-13	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956	697 days	71,70,000/-	For One-time default **Rs.25,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- per day for 697 days amounting to **Rs. 1,74,250/-.** **Total- Rs.1,99,250/-**
2013-14	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013.	334 days	33,40,000/-	For One-time default Rs.25000/- x 2 = **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- x 2 = Rs.500/- per day for 334 days amounting to **Rs.1,67,000/-.** **Total- Rs.2,17,000/-**
2014-15	Section 168 of the Companies Act,1956 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013.	799 days	79,90,000/-	For One-time default Rs.25000/- x 2 = **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 250/- x 2 = Rs.500/- per day for 799 days amounting to **Rs.3,99,500/-.** **Total- Rs.4,49,500/-**

2015-16	Section 96 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013	480 days	48,00,000/-	For One-time default **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 500/- x 2 = Rs.1000/- per day for 480 days amounting to **Rs.4,80,000/-.** **Total- Rs.5,30,000/-**
2016-17	Section 96 r/w Section 451 of Companies Act, 2013	166 days	16,60,000/-	For One-time default **Rs.50,000/-** For continuing default- Rs. 500/- x 2 = Rs.1000/- per day for 166 days amounting to **Rs 1,66,000/-.** **Total- Rs.2,16,000/-**

4.15 Total Penalty for Applicant No.1 as per the above Provisions of the Act is **Rs.18,68,250/-.**

4.16 Total Penalty for Applicant No.2 as per the above Provisions of the Act is **Rs.18,68,250/-.**

4.17 Total Penalty for Applicant No.3 as per the above Provisions of the Act is **Rs.18,68,250/-.**

4.18 Further, this Bench is of the considered view that the compounding fee imposed shall act as a sufficient deterrent against recurrence of such defaults in future while at the same time balancing the mitigating circumstances placed on record by the Petitioners.

4.19 In view of the aforesaid findings and in the interest of justice, equity and fair play, the present Compounding Application deserves to be allowed subject to payment of compounding fees as may be directed by this Tribunal.

4.20 This Compounding Application *vide* **CP No.120/MB/2024** is, therefore, **allowed and disposed of** on the terms directed above. Needless to mention, the offence shall stand compounded subject to the remittance of the Compounding Fee imposed. A compliance report, therefore, shall be placed on record.

4.21 The Registry shall send a copy of this order to the Registrar of Companies, Mumbai, Maharashtra.

4.22 Ordered accordingly. File be consigned to Records.

Sd/-

SANJIV DUTT
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

Sd/-

ASHISH KALIA
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

//LRA-Vaishnavi Shah //