

IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL: NEW DELHI
COURT-IV [SPECIAL BENCH]

ITEM No.304
IA/278/ND/2026 IN CP/159/PB/2021

IN THE MATTER OF:

Rajesh Rajpal & Ors.

....

Applicant

Versus

M/s. Rajpal Polytex Pvt Ltd & Ors.

Respondent

Under Section 241-242 of the Companies Act, 2013

Order delivered on 14.07.2026

CORAM:

SHRI MAHENDRA KHANDELWAL
HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

SHRI YOGENDRA KUMAR SINGH
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

PRESENT:

For the Applicant : Adv. Sharad R. Gupta, Adv. Lakshya Gola in
IA/278/ND/2026

For the Respondent : Adv. Ankit Singal for R1-3

HYBRID HEARING (PHYSICAL & VC)

ORDER

IA/278/ND/2026

This is an Application filed by the petitioner no.1 of CP/159/PB/2021, seeking following prayers: -

PRAYER

16 In view of the facts and circumstances stated hereinabove, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to:

- a)** To allow the present application and/or;
- b)** To exercise the inherent powers of this Hon'ble Tribunal under Rule 11 and to close the right of Respondent No.1 to file Written Submissions under Rule 41 read of the NCLT Rules, 2016 as about more than 4 year 5 months (i.e., more than 1600 days) have elapsed since the date of Notice.
- c)** To allow the petition to be heard and be decided *ex-parte qua* Respondent No.1 as per Rule 49 (1) of NCLT Rules, 2016.
- d)** To pass such other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

Heard the Ld. Counsel on behalf of the applicant.

Ld. Counsel on behalf of the R-1 is present on the basis of advance service.

Ld. Counsel on behalf of the applicant submitted that the respondent no.1 has not submitted its written submissions [wrongly mentioned as written submission, and it has to be read as reply] in terms of order dated 03.02.2022.

Ld. Counsel on behalf of the respondent no.1 submitted that he represent respondent nos.1 to 3 and reply by the respondent no.2 had been filed. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the respondent nos.1 & 3 adopts the reply filed by the respondent no.2, therefore, in view of this submission, the question of closing the right to file reply by the respondent no.1 & 3 doesn't arise. Ld. Counsel on behalf of the respondent no.1 also submitted that they have already filed Vakalatnama on behalf of the respondent nos.1 to 3 and he is appearing in the matter, therefore, the prayer that R-1 to declare ex-parte has no merit.

In view of the above, the present application bearing **IA/278/ND/2026** is dismissed.

Sd/-
(YOGENDRA KUMAR SINGH)
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

Sd/-
(MAHENDRA KHANDELWAL)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL: NEW DELHI
COURT-IV [SPECIAL BENCH]

ITEM No.411
CP/159/PB/2021

IN THE MATTER OF:

Rajesh Rajpal & Ors.

....

Applicant

Versus

M/s. Rajpal Polytex Pvt Ltd & Ors.

Respondent

Under Section 241-242 of the Companies Act, 2013

Order delivered on 14.07.2026

CORAM:

SHRI MAHENDRA KHANDELWAL
HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

SHRI YOGENDRA KUMAR SINGH
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

PRESENT:

For the Applicant : Adv. Sharad R. Gupta, Adv. Lakshya Gola

For the Respondent : Adv. Ankit Singal for R1-3

HYBRID HEARING (PHYSICAL & VC)

ORDER

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner as well as Ld. Counsel for the respondent nos.1 to 3 are present.

In our view, the respondent no.4 i.e. RoC is only a proforma party.

List this matter for arguments on **25.08.2026** before the Regular Bench.

Sd/-
(YOGENDRA KUMAR SINGH)
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

Sd/-
(MAHENDRA KHANDELWAL)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)