

**IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI**  
**COURT-V**  
**(Division Bench)**

**Item No.-505**

Appeal No. 243/252/ND/2023

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

Shree Probuild Private Limited

**.....Applicant**

**Vs.**

RoC & Anr.

**.....Respondent**

**SECTION**

U/s 252

**Order delivered on 09.04.2024**

**CORAM:**

**SHRI MAHENDRA KHANDELWAL,  
HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

**Dr. SANJEEV RANJAN,  
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

**HYBRID HEARING (PHYSICAL & VC)**

**PRESENT:**

For the Applicant : Mr. S.S. Bhati, Mr. Anurag Paliwal, Mr. Rohit Sharma,  
Advts.  
For the Respondent :  
For the RoC : Ms. Jyoti Khurana, Mr. Aakash Sharma, Advts.  
For IT Deptt. : Sr. Standing Counsel Mr. Sunil Agarwal, Jr. Standing  
Counsel Mr. Shivansh B Pandya, Mr. Utkarsh Tiwari,  
Advts.

**Corrigendum**

On perusal of order dated 03.04.2024, it is noticed that in the order dated 03.04.2024 by typographical mistake, it is written that "RoC in their report has submitted that subject to filing of the necessary returns etc. and on payment of first in the company revived having objection." However, the said is not the correct position. Therefore, this Tribunal in exercise of its power under Rule 154 of the NCLT Rules, 2016 suo moto rectifies the typographical error in the order dated 03.04.2024. Hence in the place of the "RoC in their report has submitted that subject to filing of the necessary returns etc. and on payment of

first in the company revived having objection” the sentence “RoC in their report has submitted that subject to filing of the necessary returns etc, they have no objection if the company is revived” shall be substituted. This order is to be read with order dated 03.04.2024.

**Sd/-**  
**(Dr. SANJEEV RANJAN)**  
**MEMBER (T)**

**Sd/-**  
**(MAHENDRA KHANDELWAL)**  
**MEMBER (J)**

**IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI**  
**COURT-V**  
**(Division Bench)**

**Item No.-505**

Appeal No. 243/252/ND/2023

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

Shree Probuild Private Limited

**.....Applicant**

**Vs.**

RoC & Anr.

**.....Respondent**

**SECTION**

U/s 252

**Order delivered on 03.04.2024**

**CORAM:**

**SHRI MAHENDRA KHANDELWAL,  
HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

**Dr. SANJEEV RANJAN,  
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

**HYBRID HEARING (PHYSICAL & VC)**

**PRESENT:**

For the Applicant : Mr. S.S. Bhati, Mr. Anurag Paliwal, Mr. Rohit Sharma,  
Adv.  
For the Respondent :  
For the RoC : Ms. Jyoti Khurana, Mr. Aakash Sharma, Adv.  
For IT Deptt. : Sr. Standing Counsel Mr. Sunil Agarwal, Jr. Standing  
Counsel Mr. Shivansh B Pandya, Mr. Utkarsh Tiwari,  
Adv.

**ORDER**

This is an appeal filed under Section 252 of the Companies Act, 2013 seeking revival of the Appellant company which was struck down by the order of RoC in terms of Section 248 of the companies Act, 2013. Heard the submissions made by the Ld. Counsel on behalf of the Appellant. Ld. Counsel on behalf of the RoC is present and their report is also available on the e-portal of the Tribunal. We have perused the report of the RoC. RoC in their report has submitted that subject to filing of the necessary returns etc. and on payment of first in the company revived having objection. Ld. Counsel on behalf of the

Income Tax Department is present. As mentioned in order dated 14.02.2024, Ld. Counsel on behalf of the Income Tax Department had submitted that they have no objection in the company is revived. In view of this, order in this matter is **reserved**.

**Sd/-**  
**(Dr. SANJEEV RANJAN)**  
**MEMBER (T)**

**Sd/-**  
**(MAHENDRA KHANDELWAL)**  
**MEMBER (J)**