

**IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL**  
**CHANDIGARH (COURT – II)**  
***(Through Hybrid Mode)***

**Item No. 4**

**C.P. (IB)/110(CH)2024**

**IN THE MATTER OF**  
**Indian Bank**

...

**Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Ashish Gupta**

...

**Respondent**

**Under Section: 95 (1), IBC 2016**

**Order delivered on 09.05.2024**

**CORAM:**

**SHRI. SATYA RANJAN PRASAD,**  
**HON'BLE MEMBER (T)**

**SHRI. P.S.N. PRASAD,**  
**HON'BLE MEMBER (J)**

**PRESENT:**

**For the Petitioner**

: Mr. Pradeep Kumar Pandey, Advocate

**ORDER**

Mr. Pradeep Kumar Pandey, Advocate who has appeared on behalf of the Indian Bank is directed to file a separate Vakalatnama as apparently the Bank has authorized only Mr. Amod K Dalela, Advocate to appear on their behalf and also the counsel is directed to show how the present application is maintainable under law and on facts also more particularly the limitation issue when the default has taken place in the year 2014-15, how the Bank is legally entitled to issue notice to the guarantor to discharge his guarantee obligations under the contract of the guarantee. Let this matter be posted on 10.06.2024.

Sd/-

**(SATYA RANJAN PRASAD)**  
**HON'BLE MEMBER (T)**

Sd/-

**(DR. P.S.N. PRASAD)**  
**HON'BLE MEMBER (J)**

May 09, 2024  
Mamta