

FOUNDER EDITOR

**U.K. BHARGAVA**

EDITOR

**RAKESH BHARGAVA**

HONY. CONSULTING EDITOR

**R.N. BANSAL**

SEBI & Corporate Laws comes in Six Volumes, Annual subscription for the year 2024 is ₹ 14,500. Single copy ₹ 600 only.

**Back years' volume ₹ 2600 per volume for paper back and add ₹ 250 per volume for Hard case binding.**

SEBI & Corporate Laws fortnightly is published on 1st & 16th every month.

**Non-receipt of part must be notified within 60 days of the due date.**

Address your editorial and subscription correspondence to: **Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd., 59/32, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi-110 005. Phone : 91-11-45562222.**

**Printed and Published by Ansh Bhargava on behalf of Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd. and Printed at Tan Prints (India) Pvt. Ltd., 44 Km. Mile Stone, National Highway, Rohtak Road, Village Rohad, Distt. Jhajjar (Haryana) and Published at 59/32, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi-110 005 - Editor : Rakesh Bhargava**

Material published in this part is the exclusive copyrighted property of Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd. and cannot be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means without written permission of the Publisher.

**Taxmann and its Editors do not necessarily agree with the views expressed in Magazine Section of SEBI & Corporate Laws. Views so expressed are the personal views of author(s).**

This publication is sold with the understanding that authors/editors and publishers are not responsible for the result of any action taken on the basis of this work nor for any error or omission to any person, whether a purchaser of this publication or not. All disputes are subject to jurisdiction of the Delhi High Court.

Email : [sales@taxmann.com](mailto:sales@taxmann.com)

Website : [www.taxmann.com](http://www.taxmann.com)

ISSN : 0972-818X

MODE OF CITATION [2024] 181 SCL... (..)

TOTAL PAGES [208]

# C O N T E N T S

## REPORTS : TABLE OF CASES

- ◆ BPTP Spacio Park Serene Flat Allottees Welfare Association (BAWA) v. Sudhanshu Tripathi, Director, BPTP Ltd. (SC) **380**
- ◆ Celir LLP v. Bafna Motors (Mumbai) (P.) Ltd. (SC) **439**
- ◆ Orbit Electricals (P.) Ltd. v. Deepak Kishan Chhabria (SC) **387**
- ◆ Pankaj Kumar Tiwari v. Indian Overseas Bank Asset Recovery Management Branch (SC) **372**
- ◆ Sanjay Kumar Agarwal v. State Tax Officer (SC) **340**
- ◆ Seya Industries Ltd. v. SEBI (SC) **360**
- ◆ Tottempudi Salalith v. State Bank of India (SC) **406**
- ◆ UV Asset Reconstruction Co. Ltd. v. Aria Hotels & Consultancy Services (P.) Ltd. (SC) **355**
- ◆ Vinay Yadav v. Anita Jindal (SC) **352**
- ◆ Vipin Sharma v. Kaliber Associates (P.) Ltd. (SC) **362**

## SUBJECT INDEX : CASES REPORTED

### COMPANIES ACT, 2013

#### ■ Supreme Court

##### APPEAL TO

- Where order of Supreme Court directing to proceed to declare result of Annual General Meeting (AGM) of a company was breached by scrutinizer of said meeting by acting in concert with respondent-chairperson of said company to delay said declaration, since process of Supreme Court cannot be allowed to be misused for partisan purposes in commercial disputes involving warring factions, respondent was to be directed to pay a sum of Rs. One crore and scrutinizer was to be directed to pay a sum of Rs. Ten lakhs - *Orbit Electricals (P.) Ltd. v. Deepak Kishan Chhabria (SC)* **387**

**COMPANIES ACT, 2013**

- Section 423 **387**

**INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE, 2016****■ Corporate insolvency resolution process****RESOLUTION PLAN - APPROVAL OF**

- Where proceedings had been pending before NCLAT and adjourned to 24-11-2023 with interim order to continue, Supreme Court declined to interfere with, as matter was to be considered by NCLAT on 24-11-2023, and appellant would be at liberty to move NCLAT for modification/vacation of interim order - *UV Asset Reconstruction Co. Ltd. v. Aria Hotels & Consultancy Services (P.) Ltd.* (SC) **355**

**FINANCIAL DEBT**

- Supreme Court upheld NCLAT's order, wherein it was held that NCLT had rightly admitted section 7 application filed against corporate debtor on basis of balance sheet of corporate debtor, which showed that corporate debtor had availed loan facility from financial creditor and there was a financial debt and default - *Vipin Sharma v. Kaliber Associates (P.) Ltd.* (SC) **362**
- Where appellant homebuyer failed to meet threshold requirement, which was imposed in terms of section 7 for initiation of CIRP, proceedings before NCLT to revive CIRP against corporate debtor could not be restored - *BPTP Spacio Park Serene Flat Allottees Welfare Association (BAWA) v. Sudhanshu Tripathi, Director, BPTP Ltd.* (SC) **380**

**■ Corporate Person's Adjudicating Authorities****SUPREME COURT, APPEAL TO**

- Where against order of NCLT wherein it was held that respondent sales tax department being operational creditors could not claim first charge over property of a company under liquidation, respondent filed an appeal which was dismissed by NCLAT which was subsequently, allowed by Supreme Court by an impugned order, in view of fact that liquidator of company in liquidation had failed to make out any mistake or error apparent on face of record in impugned judgment, instant review petition could not be entertained and same was to be dismissed - *Sanjay Kumar Agarwal v. State Tax Officer* (SC) **340**
- Supreme Court upheld NCLAT's order wherein it was held that where financial creditor had accepted due amount with 6 per cent interest per annum but was now demanding interest at rate of 18 per cent, recovery proceedings of this nature do not fall within scope and ambit of words 'for any purpose other than resolution' as defined under section 65 and, therefore, order of NCLT admitting CIRP application was to be set aside - *Vinay Yadav v. Anita Jindal* (SC) **352**

**■ Limitation period**

- Question of election between fora for enforcement of debt under RDB Act, 1993 and initiation of CIRP under IBC arises only after a recovery certificate is issued, reliefs under two statutes are different and once CIRP results in declaration of moratorium, enforcement mechanism under RDB Act or SARFAESI Act gets suspended - *Tottempudi Salalith v. State Bank of India* (SC) **406**

**INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE, 2016**

- Section 5(8) **362, 380**
- Section 31 **355**
- Section 62 **340, 352**
- Section 238A **406**

**SEBI (SUBSTANTIAL ACQUISITION OF SHARES AND TAKEOVERS) REGULATIONS, 1997****■ Acquisition of fifteen per cent or more of shares or voting rights of any company**

- Where no reply had been filed to *ex-parte ad-interim* order-cum-show cause notice passed by Whole Time Member (WTM) of SEBI and impugned order which had been passed by SAT had left it open to appellant to submit a reply to show cause notice, there was no reason to entertain appeal against order of SAT and accordingly, same was to be dismissed - *Seya Industries Ltd. v. SEBI (SC)* **360**

**SEBI (SUBSTANTIAL ACQUISITION OF SHARES AND TAKEOVERS) REGULATIONS, 1997**

- Regulation 10 **360**

**SECURITISATION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF FINANCIAL ASSETS AND ENFORCEMENT OF SECURITY INTEREST ACT, 2002****■ Civil Court not to have jurisdiction**

- No writ petition was to be entertained by Bombay High Court challenging order passed by Civil Court, Bihar appointing receiver for taking possession of mortgaged property when a statutory remedy was available before concerned Court in Bihar, however, order passed by Civil Court would remain stayed due to suppression of fact that bank had already taken possession of mortgaged property - *Pankaj Kumar Tiwari v. Indian Overseas Bank Asset Recovery Management Branch (SC)* **372**

**■ Enforcement of security interest**

- Right of borrower to redeem mortgage under section 13(8) of SARFAESI Act is available only till date of publication of auction notice and not till completion of sale or transfer of secured asset in favour of auction purchaser - *Celir LLP v. Bafna Motors (Mumbai) (P.) Ltd. (SC)* **439**

**SECURITISATION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF FINANCIAL ASSETS AND ENFORCEMENT OF SECURITY INTEREST ACT, 2002**

- Section 13 **439**
- Section 34 **372**

**MAGAZINE**

- ◆ Wrangling over interpretation regarding position of Nominee//*Neelam Kumar Jain* **25**
- ◆ Importance of Competition Law for MSMEs in India//*Dr. H. K. Mudgil, Kapil Mudgil* **34**
- ◆ Fintech - Self-Regulatory Organizations (SROs) and RBI: A Regulatory Symbiosis in the Digital Age//*Rachit Sharma* **44**