

COMPANY LAW BOARD  
NEW DELHI BENCH  
NEW DELHI

CP NO. 59/MB/2015

CA NO.

PRESENT: CHIEF JUSTICE M. M. KUMAR  
CHAIRMAN

ATTENDANCE-CUM-ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING OF NEW DELHI BENCH OF THE  
COMPANY LAW BOARD ON 10.05.2016

NAME OF THE COMPANY: **Sh. Shailesh Nagindas Shah & Ors.**  
**Vs.**  
**M/s. Sun Shine Realtors Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.**

SECTION OF THE COMPANIES ACT: 397, 398 of the Companies Act 1956.

S.NO.	NAME	DESIGNATION	REPRESENTATION	SIGNATURE
1.	Mr. Sudipto Senkar	Advocate	Petitioners	Khaja
2.	Mr. Rahul Chitnis	Advocates		
3.	Mr. Trigoon Patwardhan			
4.	Miss Krishna Rappa			
5.	<del>Mr. Ashwini Sinha</del>	<del>Advocate</del>	Respondent NOS. 27A, 27B	MA
6.	Mr. Anurag Agrawal	Adv.		
7.	Mr. Shaan Mehta			
8.	Mr. Rajendra Sarankar			
9.	Mr. Devanshu P. Desai		- Adv. for Respondent No. 22A, 22B, 23 and 24A 24B	
10.	Adv. Varun Shah			
	i/b Rajesh Sharma & Associates		- Adv. for Respondent No. 1 & 2	

**ORDER**

A copy of the rejoinder has already been handed over to the counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 & 2. Some other Respondents (R-22) have filed reply in the court today and a copy thereof has been furnished to the counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarkar learned senior counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that whole dispute can be shortened if a valuer is appointed for the purpose of valuation of the entire assets of the Respondent No.1-company.

However learned counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 states that copy of the rejoinder has been received two days back and needs some time to study the same and then address the court.

The other Respondents are buyers of the flat and have requested that their names be dropped from the array of parties because they have nothing to do with dispute between the Petitioner and Respondent No.1 & 2. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts I am of the view that the buyers who have joined as respondents need not to appear till specific order are passed calling them to appear.

It is made clear that the pendency of these proceedings should not be construed as a block in construction by respondent No.1 & 2. Even otherwise no contrary order has been passed ad interim in that regard.

To come up for further consideration on the issue of valuer on 30.5.2016 at 2.00 pm.

  
(CHIEF JUSTICE M.M. KUMAR)  
CHAIRMAN

Dated: 10.05.2016

(vidya)