

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
AT CHENNAI

(APPELLATE JURISDICTION)

Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (Ins) No. 387/2026
(IA Nos. 1117 & 1118/2026)

In the matter of:

Frontline Enterprises Limited

...Appellant

Vs

**Global Insolvency Professionals Pvt Ltd,
RP of Sri Nagakrishna Chemicals & Anr.**

...Respondents

Present :

For Appellant : Mr. T Ravichandran, Advocate

For Respondents : Mr. Amir Bavani, Advocate for R1
Mr. CS Shikhar Pandey, Advocate for R2

ORDER
(Hybrid Mode)

10.08.2026:

This appeal is preferred by a financial creditor who, in essence, challenges the claim made by the second respondent/the petitioning financial creditor (Madhya Pradesh Financial Corporation) under Section 7, IBC on the ground that the second respondent had made a claim several folds more than the amount of default as alleged in Part IV of its petition. The learned Adjudicating Authority has directed the resolution professional to ascertain the same, who in turn had engaged a chartered accountant for the said purpose, and the said chartered accountant has initially reduced the total claim amount by almost one-third, but later revised it more than the amount claimed, which was allowed by the

Adjudicating Authority vide the impugned order. The learned counsel for the appellant submits that this is unjustifiable since there cannot be any penal interest over the compounding of the interest already made, and unless the amount actually due is not determined, it would affect the voting share in the Coc, which would jeopardise the rights of the appellant as a financial creditor in taking a collective decision of the Coc for running the CIRP.

2. Appearing for the resolution professional, Mr. Amir Bavani would submit that the first respondent, the resolution professional, has since been replaced by Mr. Anand Mohan Pandeya and that he is entering appearance for the new RP. To save time, we Suo motu replace M/s Global Insolvency Professionals Pvt. Ltd. with Anand Mohan Pandeya as resolution professional of the corporate debtor. We require the appellant to file an amended memo of parties.

3. Mr. CS Shikhar Pandey enters appearance for the second respondent.

4. For the present, we require the CIR process to continue up to the stage of receiving the plans, but no decision in approving the plans, be taken without the leave of this Tribunal.

5. The appellant is permitted to file a copy of the Section 7 petition filed by the second respondent. The appellant submits that he is going to confine his arguments based on the materials placed before the Adjudicating Authority. Since no new materials are placed before us, we do not consider it necessary that

respondents may have to file any replies. However, they are permitted to file any additional documents if they may support their case.

6. Both sides are required to submit their respective notes of submissions.

List this appeal, under the caption, 'For Orders' on **28.09.2026**.

[Justice N. Seshasayee]
Member (Judicial)

[Jatindranath Swain]
Member (Technical)

DD/MS/AK