NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 1266 of 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

Chandra Prakash Jain **...Appellant(s)**

Versus

Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India Through Its Disciplinary Committee **...Respondent(s)**

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. Krishnendu Dutta and Mr. Sunil Fernandes, Sr. Advocates with Dr. Pankaj Garg, Mr. Malak Bhatt, Mr. Saahil Bahety, Ms. Muskaan Chawla, Mr. Shreyansh Chopra, Mr. Anshul, Mr. Kailash Ram, Advocates.

For Respondents : Ms. Madhavi Divan, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Amrita Singh, Ms. Aishani Narain, Advocates for IBBI.

O R D E R
(Hybrid Mode)

06.11.2026: This appeal was listed on 30.07.2026, when the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent was not available and the matter was adjourned for listing on 10.08.2026. The following interim relief was granted:

> *"Till the next date of hearing, the order for cancellation of the license shall be kept in abeyance qua other assignments barring CD-1 to 12."*

2. Subsequently, we heard the request for interim relief in the case of Ritesh Prakash Adatiya v. Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India in Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1733 of 2026 and Rohit Ramesh Mehra v. Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India in Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1495 of 2026. The applications for interim relief were disposed of vide order dated 05.10.2026 and 13.10.2026, respectively.

3. We note that a Civil Appeal No. 13578 of 2026 was filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court had dismissed as withdrawn the said Civil Appeal in the case of Ritesh Prakash Adatiya vide order dated 29.10.2026. Similar issues are involved in request for interim relief in this appeal.

4. We have already heard the ld. Sr. Counsel for the Appellant in detail on different dates on interim relief. The Ld. Sr. Counsel for the Respondent had opposed the interim relief. Now the appellant wishes to argue finally and prays the interim order be extended, which would not be possible to conclude today due to paucity of time, despite hearing the appellant for one hour. The Ld. Senior counsel for respondent had vehemently opposed the extension of relief in the wake of our earlier orders in different appeals on same issue; hence we proceed to decide upon the issue of extending the interim relief.

5. The Ld. IBBI in the impugned order dated 03.07.2026 has noted that the Appellant was a Resolution Professional appointed in the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Processes (**"CIRPs"**) of Anil Dhirubhai Ambani Group (**"ADAG"**). In the two-show cause notices issued to the Appellant, the Ld. IBBI has noted short comings in the CIRP of CD- 1 to 12. It is noted that the Appellant has acted as a facilitator in grave and systematic misuse of the IBC framework across 12 CIRPs. The Resolution Professional has failed to notice and failed to take remedial action regarding the conduct of systematically co-ordinated CIRPs. The Resolution Professional failed to note that the entire insolvency eco system was managed by a single network, including a common applicant, a Financial Creditor, a common Resolution Professional and an identical CoC. The Resolution Professional failed to note the SEBI order dated

28.04.2024 in the matter of Reliance Home Finance Limited (RHFL) and 27 entities relating to potential avoidance and had failed to file applications for PUFE transaction. IBBI noted the Resolution Professional compromised the integrity of the bidding process which lead to by the repetitive selection of M/s Micro Capital Pvt. Ltd. in CD-1 to CD-10 as the sole Successful Resolution Applicant (SRA). The negligence and misconduct of the Resolution Professional led to negligible realisation in these 12 CIRPs amounting to realisation in decimals (less than 1%). The IBBI through the impugned order cancelled the registration of the Appellant and the order was made affective after 30 days from the date of issuance of the order.

6. We have examined the issues in the CIRP of ADAG in our earlier order dated 05.10.2026 and 13.10.2026 where we have considered in detail request for grant of interim relief and have denied the interim relief. The order dated 05.10.2026 was even examined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Civil Appeal was dismissed as withdrawn.

7. We note that IBBI is granted power to register insolvency professional as also to renew, withdraw, suspend or cancel such registration. Section 206 of IBC 2016 states that no person shall render his services as IP without being enrolled as a member of an IP agency and registration with the board. The registration of IP is governed by Section 207 of IBC, 2016.

8. We note the Resolution Professional can be replaced in any CIRP at any time and there is no irreversible prejudice to stakeholders should the challenge ultimately fail.

9. We note that ED had seized documents, named, "Project Help", showing a systematic attempt by the ADAG group to siphon away money taken from

public financial institutions, using insolvency as a tool for pre-determined object of extinguishment of debts.

10. We find that transaction auditor had identified the lack of information while conducting transaction audit, yet the Resolution Professional failed to file an application under Section 19(2) before the Ld. NCLT seeking these documents. No PUFE applications under Section 43, 45, 50 or 66 of the IBC, 2016 were filed by the Resolution Professional.

11. We are conscious of the irreparable injury which may be caused to the process of CIRP involving high financial stake if the Resolution Professional is allowed to continue, when his registration has been cancelled.

12. We also note legislative intent as stated in Section 7(5)(a) and Section 9(5)(e) which prohibit IRP to be appointed if disciplinary proceedings are pending against him. When the legislative intent is not to allow an IP whose conduct is being questioned to act as Resolution Professional, grant of interim relief in a case where Resolution Professional is found guilty of misconduct after due service of show cause notice and after personal hearing by the disciplinary committee of IBBI, goes against the legislative intent.

13. We also note that similar view has been taken by this Tribunal in in the case of *Arunava Sikdar v. Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India Through its Disciplinary Committee, Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 1384 of 2026.* The said order was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Civil Appeal No. 12811/2026* vide order dated 21.09.2026 has held as under:

> *"1. We are not inclined to entertain this appeal filed against an interim order passed by the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, in Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 1384/2026.*

14. After considering the facts of this case and for the reasons stated above, we hold that there is no case for grant/extension of *ad -interim* relief sought in the present IA No. 4899 of 2026. We clarify that nothing stated in this order shall prejudice the rights and contentions of the Appellant in the main appeal, which shall be examined on its merits on final hearing.

I.A. No. 4899 of 2026 is disposed of accordingly. List the appeal on **06.01.2027**.

[Justice Yogesh Khanna]
Officiating Chairperson

[Mr. Barun Mitra]
Member (Technical)

[Mr. Ajai Das Mehrotra]
Member (Technical)

BM/Ram N./Manu D.