

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL
COURT ROOM NO. 1,
MUMBAI BENCH

Item No. 28
CP/355(MB)2017

CORAM:

SH. PRABHAT KUMAR JUSTICE VIRENDRASINGH BISHT (Retd.)
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL) HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING ON **05.04.2024**

NAME OF THE PARTIES: **RONNY GEORGE V/s THE PROFESSIONAL**
COURIERS PVT LTD & 6 ORS

Section 241(1) Sec. 242(4) of the Companies Act, 2013

ORDER

1. Mr. Ashish Agankar, Advocate appeared for the Petitioner.
2. Ms. Rhea Parkash, Advocate i/b Crawford Bayley & Co. appeared for the Respondent.
3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks some time to argue the matter.
4. On perusal of the daily order file we find that last opportunity was granted to the Petitioner to clear the defects within two weeks on 19.03.2024.
5. However, matter is still shown under re-filing. This petition was earlier dismissed for non-prosecution on account of non-appearance of the Petitioner and was restored on 17.01.2024.
6. Even after passage of two and half months the Petitioner have not taken any cogent steps to further prosecute petition.
7. In view of above, **CP No. 355 of 2017** is dismissed for want of prosecution.

Sd/-

PRABHAT KUMAR
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

Sd/-

JUSTICE VIRENDRASINGH BISHT
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL

COURT ROOM NO. 1,

MUMBAI BENCH

Item No. 09

RCP(CA)/3(MB)2024

CORAM:

SH. PRABHAT KUMAR

JUSTICE V.G. BISHT (Retd.)

HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING ON **19.04.2024**

NAME OF THE PARTIES: **RONNY GEORGE VS THE PROFESSIONAL
COURIERS PVT LTD & 6 ORS**

Section 241(1) Sec. 242(4) of the Companies Act, 2013

ORDER

Adv. Rhea Parkash i/b Crowford Bayley & Co. for the Respondent present.

The Petitioner is not present today.

The Ld. Counsel for the Respondent submits that the Petitioner has placed on record Restored Petition without seeking restoration of the original petition.

We notice that the present petition has been listed by the Registry after re-numbering of the petition as restored petition, however the restored petition was listed with the Original Petition No.355 of 2017 and was dismissed again for non-prosecution. Accordingly, the Respondent appears to be under misconception while pleading the fresh petition has been filed. As the petition already restored has already been dismissed again under original petition no, and the original petition listed today is rendered **infructuous** and **dismissed** accordingly.

Sd/-

**PRABHAT KUMAR
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

Rehan Shaikh

Sd/-

**JUSTICE V.G. BISHT
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**