

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
AT CHENNAI
(APPELLATE JURISDICTION)

Company Appeal (AT) (CH) No.113/2025
(IA Nos. 1269 & 1270/2025)

In the matter of:

3A Capital Services Limited
V
M/s. NGEF Limited

... Appellant

... Respondent

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. Rafeeq Peermohideen, Advocate
For Ms. Anusha Peri, Advocate
For Respondent : Mr. Saji P John, Advocate

ORDER
(Hybrid Mode)

16.07.2026:

In the instant company appeal, the controversy agitated is as against the rejection of an application seeking impleadment of CanBank, as one of the Respondent to the company petition.

In view of the finding that, has been recorded in para.8 of the impugned order, to justify the necessity of the impleadment application was on the ground that, the original RNCD holder, as it has later stepped into the shoes of the CanBank on the basis of the assignment, there was no necessity for CanBank to be impleaded.

The reference and the finding recorded in para. 8, it refers to the assignment deed. Hence, we called upon the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant to place the assignment deed on record by an order that was passed by us on 29.04.2026. In compliance thereto, the Appellant has filed certain documents but the assignment deed was not brought on record. It has been argued by the Ld. Counsel for the Appellant that, in fact, there is no assignment deed at all. At present, we are not

considering this argument for the reason being that, owing to the finding recorded in the impugned order and because of the fact that, there has been an assignment of rights between the two entities, there must have been a deed.

The Appellant is granted yet another opportunity to venture out the possibility to trace the assignment deed and place the same on record or make a specific statement by way of an affidavit as to whether an assignment deed actually exist or not.

List this Appeal on **01.09.2026**.

[Justice Sharad Kumar Sharma]
Member (Judicial)

[Jatindranath Swain]
Member (Technical)

AR/MS/AK