

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

**Item No. 1**  
**(Supplementary List)**

**IA(IBC)/1104(CH)2024**  
**In**  
**CP (IB) No. 4(CHD)2024**  
**(Main matter on 27.05.2024)**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**Kamla Mehrotra**

**...Petitioner**

**Under Section: 94 IBC 2016**

**Application under Rule 11 of NCLT Rules, 2016**

**Order delivered on 30.04.2024**

**CORAM:**

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

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

**PRESENT:**

**For the Petitioner** : Mr. Aalok Jagga and Mr. APS Madaan, Advocates

**For the RP** : 1) Mr. Viren Sharma, Advocate along with  
2) Mr. Dewan Asparan Nabi, RP in person *via*  
Video-Conferencing Mode.

**ORDER**

**IA(IBC)/1104(CH)2024**

Heard the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner as well as counsel for the RP as well as Resolution Professional, RP in person appeared *via* video-conferencing mode.

The present application has been filed under Rule 11 of the NCLT Rules, 2016 by the applicant-Resolution Professional for recalling the direction to communicate the conduct of Resolution Professional to IBBI, as per direction passed vide order dated 18.03.2024.

In view of the facts mentioned in the present application and in the interest of justice, we have carefully gone through the contents of the application and also heard the submissions made by the counsel for the Resolution Professional. The Resolution Professional has already filed the report under Section 99 of the Code and paid cost in compliance with the direction passed by this Adjudicating Authority vide order dated 18.03.2024.

Further, the counsel for the Resolution Professional has submitted that there is no deliberate delay on the part of the applicant in filing the report. Since the cost has already been paid for filing the report and the applicant in his application has submitted that he will be more vigilant and will ensure compliance of the directions of this Adjudicating Authority, this Adjudicating Authority is of the view that no *prejudice* will be caused if direction to communicate the conduct of Resolution Professional to IBBI passed vide order dated 18.03.2024 is recalled. Therefore, the present application is stands allowed and Registry may not resort to send any communication for the delay in filing the report as cost are already imposed and which was paid by the Resolution Professional.

The Resolution Professional is present and has apologized for what had been happened earlier. The Resolution Professional may ensure to be strictly alert to time-schedules hereafter.

However, this Adjudicating Authority directs the Resolution Professional to be more careful and exercise due diligence and complete the resolution process on war footing basis.

IA(IBC)/1104(CH)2024 stands allowed and disposed of.

This order is dictated in the open Court in the presence of counsel for the petitioner as well as counsel for the RP as well as Resolution Professional, RP in person appeared *via* video-conferencing mode.

Sd/-

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

Sd/-

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