

IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU BENCH

[Through Physical hearing/ VC Mode (Hybrid)]

ITEM No.47
CP No. 112/BB/2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

Mr. Ritesh Ujjwal

... Petitioner

Vs.

Kofluence Tech Pvt Ltd & anr

... Respondent

Petition under Sec 241-242 of CA,2013

Order delivered on: 09.10.2026

CORAM:

SHRI. SUNIL KUMAR AGGARWAL
HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

SHRI. RADHAKRISHNA SREEPADA
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

COUNSELS PRESENT:

For the Petitioner

: Senior Advocate Dhananjay Joshi,
Adv. Sneha Nagaraj

For the Respondents 2 to 4

: Senior Advocate CK Nandkumar,
Hemanth R. Rao, Puneet Rathsharma,
Akash Srinivasan, Natasha Agarwal.
Lekha Chandrasekar & Meera Ramaswamy

ORDER

1. Heard Ld. Sr. Counsels for the parties.
2. The outlines of case have been briefed by Ld. Sr. Counsel for the petitioner. He primarily, at this stage, seeks interim reliefs- A, F, G, and J contending that the petitioner is being completely overlooked/sidelined by respondent No.2 despite being the original founder of respondent No.1 and now its only other director. The payments being made from the accounts of Respondent No.1 to related party companies is also sought to be put on hold.

3. Ld. Sr. Counsel for the respondent has contended that the petitioner is ultimately seeking an exit from respondent No.1, and has dressed up the petition as an Oppression and Mismanagement case by misusing the process. Even otherwise his monetary claims cannot be the subject matter of this petition. The petitioner being the only other director in company seeks to bring about a deadlock by seeking concurrence for every decision taken in the Board of Directors. So far as the alleged related party transactions are concerned, the same have been made only after approval of petitioner which he cannot now resent.

4. In an Oppression and Mismanagement matter, the Tribunal is expected to ensure that the functions and health of company is not jeopardized. Since the petitioner cannot claim to be an Investor of respondent No.1, the pre-condition of Reserve Matters in Articles of Association would not prima facie apply to him.

5. Taking into account the facts and circumstance produced on record, the **respondent No.1 is hereby directed to provide the records, documents and data to the petitioner as per his legal entitlement as a Director and Shareholder of Respondent No.1.** To be fair, consent to this extent has himself been conveyed by Ld, Sr. Counsel for respondent No. 2 to 4.

6. Let notice of petition be sent to other respondents who shall file objections within three weeks of being served with copy to petitioner. Let the respondent No. 2 to 4 file their objections in three weeks with copy to the petitioner. The petitioner may file rejoinder/s, if any, in another three weeks with copies to concerned quarters.

7. List the matter on **19.11.2026**.

Sd/-
RADHAKRISHNA SREEPADA
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

Jones

Sd/-
SUNIL KUMAR AGGARWAL
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)