

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
AT CHENNAI
(APPELLATE JURISDICTION)

Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 551/2026

In the matter of :

Union Bank of India & 4 Ors.

... Appellants

Vs

**Abbay Narayan Manudbane,
Liquidator of Sri Ganga Steel Enterprises Pvt Ltd**

... Respondent

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. T. Ravichandran, Advocate
For Respondent : Ms. Nisha & Mr. Prashant Thakre, Advocates
for Liquidator

WITH

Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 555/2026
IA No. 1551/2026

In the matter of :

Union Bank of India & 4 Ors.

... Appellants

Vs

Puissant Global Pvt Ltd & 2 Ors.

... Respondents

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. T. Ravichandran, Advocate
For Respondent : Mr. SR Raghunathan & Mr. Arjun Suresh,
Advocates for R1
Ms. Nisha & Mr. Prashant Thakre, Advocates for R2

WITH

Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 559/2026
IA Nos. 1558 & 1559/2026

In the matter of :

Puissant Global Pvt Ltd

... Appellants

Vs

**Abbey Narayan Manudbane,
Liquidator of Sri Ganga Steel Enterprises Pvt Ltd
& Anr.**

... Respondents

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. Arjun Suresh, Advocate

For Respondent : Ms. Nisha & Mr. Prashant Thakre, Advocates for R1

WITH

Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 560/2026

IA Nos. 1560 & 1561/2026

In the matter of :

Puissant Global Pvt Ltd

... Appellants

Vs

**Abbey Narayan Manudbane,
Liquidator of Sri Ganga Steel Enterprises Pvt Ltd
& 6 Ors.**

... Respondents

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. Arjun Suresh, Advocate

For Respondent : Ms. Nisha & Mr. Prashant Thakre, Advocates for R1
Mr. Ravichandran, Advocate for R3

ORDER
(Hybrid Mode)

07.10.2026: Today Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 551/2026 &

Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 555/2026 alone were listed for admission.

In the course of the submission, we were informed that the 1st respondent in both

these appeals, has filed independent appeals in Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS)

No. 559/2026 & Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 560/2026 is not listed

today, since they are arising from the same order we directed the registry to list it vide the special list, challenging the very same set of orders which are challenged in Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 551/2026 & Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 555/2026.

- a) The appellant submits that, certain GSEL and SMPL are sister concerns. They both are financed by a common lender (Consortium of banks)/the appellants in Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 551/2026 & Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 555/2026. Both GSEL and SMPL are drawn into CIRP vide separate orders of the learned Adjudicating Authority in two independent proceedings, one initiated under Section 9 against GSEL and another under Section 7 initiated against SMPL.
- b) GSEL has obtained lease of certain plot of property in the industrial estate of SIPCOT. The lease is for 99 years in both instances. While so, one of the asset which is given under lease with GSEL was sub-leased by it to its sister concern SMPL.
- c) The 1st respondent herein is the successful resolution applicant in the CIRP of SMPL. The 1st respondent has partly implemented the resolution plan, and as to the rest, there is some controversy which is the subject matter of Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (Ins) No. 440 of 2026.

- d) It may be stated that the SRA of M/s. SMPL has taken possession of the property, which is subleased to the corporate debtor (GSEL). It would now prefer IA No. 545/2025 before the learned Adjudicating Authority to substitute it in the place of SMPL.
- e) Taking a pause here and moving to the CIRP of GSEL, it has gone into liquidation. As stated, earlier GSEL had leasehold rights over two plots of land, of which and has explained, one has been subleased to SMPL.
- f) So far as the other plot is concerned, SIPCOT, the lessor of the plot as terminated the lease and we are informed that the termination of the lease was even before GSEL was drawn into CIRP. This termination of lease was challenged by M/s. Sri Ganga Steel Enterprises Private Limited before the Hon'ble Madras High Court, and it came to be dismissed by the learned Single Judge.
- g) A writ appeal came to be filed and that was eventually closed owing to the commencement of CIRP process, with some right to revive the appeal in certain circumstances, which is not very germane for the present. With one property already involved in the resolution process of SMPL and another property whose lease has been terminated by SIPCOT. The liquidator of GSEL finds no property from which anything could be realised. In these circumstances, the liquidator has

taken out IA (IBC)(Dissolution) 6 of 2025 for dissolution of GSEL.

Both these petitions were taken up together and were disposed of vide separate orders of the learned Adjudicating Authority, both dated 10.09.2026.

h) So far as IA No. 545/2025 is concerned, the learned Adjudicating Authority dismissed it inter alia on the ground that SMPL has already been ordered to be liquidated (which is now under challenge in Company Appeal (At) (Ins) No. 440 of 2026).

i) And turning to the other property, since its lease is already terminated, the Tribunal allowed IA (IBC)(Dissolution) 6 of 2025 and directed dissolution of GSEL.

2. Both the banks as well as the SRA are now considered their respective rights which are in peril. The concern of the bank is that, if GSEL is allowed to be dissolved at least one security it has in the property of SMPL, over which a sublease is created in favour of SMPL, may also be lost because the principal lease right might stand extinguished. This is the concern shared by the SRA too.

3. It is in these circumstances, to secure whatever security interest the lenders have over the sublease rights of SMPL the Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 551/2026 & Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 555/2026 are instituted.

4. Turning to SRA for identical reason, it has also filed two other appeals, i.e., Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 559/2026 & Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (INS) No. 560/2026.

5. In all these four appeals, Ms. Nisha Kumari Sah takes notice for the liquidator and Mr. T. Ravichandran for banks.

6. In all these four appeals, the respective appellants are directed to take notice only to SIPCOT by all modes except through substituted service.

7. The lender banks have taken out IA No. 1551/2026 seeking interim injunction on the following terms:

- a) Pass an order of injunction restraining Respondent No. 2 (SIPCOT) from resuming possession of Plot No. B-20 E, SIPCOT Industrial Estate, Gummidipoondi, or creating any third-party encumbrance, allotment, or leasehold interest thereon, pending disposal of the Appeal;*
- b) Direct Respondents to maintain status quo regarding the possession and leasehold rights of the Corporate Debtor's properties; and*
- c) Pass such further order(s) as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.*

8. The SRA have taken out IA No. 1559/2026 and has sought stay of order of dissolution passed in IA (IBC)(Dissolution) 6 of 2025.

9. After carefully considering the submissions, we consider it appropriate to stay the order of dissolution and direct the preservation of present status quo to serve the purpose and to meet the ends of justice.

List these appeals on **27.10.2026** at **4:00 PM**.

[Justice N Seshasayee]
Member (Judicial)

[Jatindranath Swain]
Member (Technical)

SN/LP/MS/AK