

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL KOCHI BENCH

CORAM:

SHRI VINAY GOEL, HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

SHRI RAVICHANDRAN RAMASAMY, HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

PETITION No./IA No.	IA(IBC)/128/KOB/2026 IN IA(IBC)/133/KOB/2025 IN IA(IBC)/196/KOB/2021 in IBA/13/KOB/2020
SECTION	RULE 11,51,57 NCLT R/W ORDER 21 RULE 54,64 OF THE CPC & SEC. 35(2) & REG. 33 SCHEDULE 1 IBBI
NAME OF PARTIES	K PARAMESWARAN NAIR (LIQUIDATOR) IN THE MATTER OF SREE BHADRA PARKS & RESORTS LTD V/S K N NARAYANAN NAMBOODIRIPAD & 5 OTHERS
PETITIONERS ADVOCATE/ PROFESSIONAL	INDIA LAW
RESPONDENTS ADVOCATE/ PROFESSIONAL	VR GOPU, AKHIL SURESH, KALLIYANI KRISHNA B

16 JULY 2026

O R D E R

IA(IBC)/128/KOB/2026 IN IA(IBC)/133/KOB/2025 IN IA(IBC)/196/KOB/2021 in IBA/13/KOB/2020

Ld. Counsel, Mr. Vinod P V, appears on behalf of Applicant/Liquidator through virtual mode. Proxy Counsel, Ms. Nandana P, appears physically on behalf of R1 to R5. None appeared on behalf of R6.

At the outset, this Adjudicating Authority put a query to the proxy Counsel appearing for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 regarding compliance with the earlier orders. In response thereto, the proxy Counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 submitted that some of the Respondents do not possess passports and that the person who was earlier residing abroad is now in India. Accordingly, it was submitted that the direction to furnish attested copies of passports may be waived.

Having heard the submissions of the Counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5, this Adjudicating Authority is of the considered view that, if any of the Respondents do not possess passports, they may file an affidavit to that effect. However, in respect of the remaining Respondents, the directions issued earlier are required to be complied in letter and spirit.

It is evident that Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 have not complied with the earlier orders passed by this Adjudicating Authority.

In the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 to comply with the earlier orders before the next date of hearing. Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 cannot be permitted to deal with the proceedings according to their own whims and fancies. The chequered history of adjournments in the present case raises a genuine suspicion regarding the intention of the Respondents. Though a strict order could be passed at this stage, considering the presence of the proxy junior counsel appearing on behalf of the said Respondents, this Adjudicating Authority refrains from passing any strict order.

The repeated attempts to seek adjournments and thereby prolong the proceedings with a view to defeating the objectives of the IBC, 2016 is indeed a serious matter which requires appropriate consideration.

Further, the Court Master has brought to the notice of this Tribunal that, while uploading the orders dated 07.07.2026, the concerned official, due to inadvertence, picked the file of draft orders from the computer and mistakenly uploaded the same, resulting in errors in the next date of hearing mentioned in certain orders uploaded on the said date. This case is one of such cases. The concerned official is directed to exercise due care and caution while uploading orders in future. The Court Master is further directed to inform the concerned Counsels of the aforesaid inadvertent error, if they approach the Registry seeking clarification, and to bring the matter to the notice of this Tribunal whenever such cases are listed on the cause list for hearing.

It is clarified that in the daily order dated 07.07.2026, the next date of hearing was correctly recorded as 10.07.2026. However, in the uploaded version of the order, owing to the inadvertent uploading of the draft order, the next date of hearing was erroneously shown as 08.07.2026. Accordingly, the uploaded order dated 07.07.2026 stands rectified, and the next date of hearing shall be read as 10.07.2026 instead of 08.07.2026. At request, this case is adjourned to **17.07.2026**.

IA(IBC)/134/KOB/2025 IN IA(IBC)/133/KOB/2025 IN IA(IBC)/196/KOB/2021 in IBA/13/KOB/2020

Ld. Counsel, Mr. Vinod P V, appears on behalf of Applicant/Liquidator through virtual mode. Proxy Counsel, Ms. Nandana P, appears physically on behalf of R1 to R5. None appeared on behalf of R6.

At the outset, this Adjudicating Authority put a query to the proxy Counsel appearing for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 regarding compliance with the earlier orders. In response thereto, the proxy Counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 submitted that some of the Respondents do not possess passports and that the person who was earlier residing abroad is now in India. Accordingly, it was submitted that the direction to furnish attested copies of passports may be waived.

Having heard the submissions of the Counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5, this Adjudicating Authority is of the considered view that, if any of the Respondents do not possess passports, they may file an affidavit to that effect. However, in respect of the remaining Respondents, the directions issued earlier are required to be complied in letter and spirit.

It is evident that Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 have not complied with the earlier orders passed by this Adjudicating Authority.

In the interest of justice, one last and final opportunity is granted to Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 to comply with the earlier orders before the next date of hearing. Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 cannot be permitted to deal with the proceedings according to their own whims and fancies. The chequered history of adjournments in the present case raises a genuine suspicion regarding the intention of the Respondents. Though a strict order could be passed at this stage, considering the presence of the proxy junior counsel appearing on behalf of the said Respondents, this Adjudicating Authority refrains from passing any strict order.

The repeated attempts to seek adjournments and thereby prolong the proceedings with a view to defeating the objectives of the IBC, 2016 is indeed a serious matter which requires appropriate consideration.

Further, the Court Master has brought to the notice of this Tribunal that, while uploading the orders dated 07.07.2026, the concerned official, due to inadvertence, picked the file of draft orders from the computer and mistakenly uploaded the same, resulting in errors in the next date of hearing mentioned in certain orders uploaded on the said date. This case is one of such cases. The concerned official is directed to exercise due care and caution while uploading orders in future. The Court Master is further directed to inform the concerned Counsels of the aforesaid inadvertent error, if they approach the Registry seeking clarification, and to bring the matter to the notice of this Tribunal whenever such cases are listed on the cause list for hearing.

It is clarified that in the daily order dated 07.07.2026, the next date of hearing was correctly recorded as 10.07.2026. However, in the uploaded version of the order, owing to the inadvertent uploading of the draft order, the next date of hearing was erroneously shown as 08.07.2026. Accordingly, the uploaded order dated 07.07.2026

(5)

stands rectified, and the next date of hearing shall be read as 10.07.2026 instead of 08.07.2026.

At request, this case is adjourned to **17.07.2026**.

Sd/-
RAVICHANDRAN RAMASAMY
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

Sd/-
VINAY GOEL
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)