

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL BENGALURU BENCH

ATTENDANCE CUM ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING OF NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU BENCH, BENGALURU, HELD ON 19.03.2021

CAUSE LIST

PRESENT: 1. Hon'ble Member (J), Shri Rajeswara Rao Vittanala

2. Hon'ble Member (T), Shri Ashutosh Chandra

CP/CA No.	Purpose	Sec	Name of Petitioner	Petitioner Advocate	Name of Respondent	Respondent Advocate
CP(IB) No. 305/BB/2019	For pronounce-ment of order in IA 58/2021 to set aside the decision of RP IA 59/2021 to set aside the decision of RP - CIRP	Sec 7 of I&B Code 2016	M/s Kotak Mahindra Bank		M/s Arun Shelters Pvt Ltd	Sripriya Kumar , RP , Vijay Kumar for RP, Anandarama & Prashanth for IA 58 & 59/2021

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER/s:

ADVOCATE FOR RESPONDENT/s:

No No

ORDER

I.A No. 58/2021 & I.A No. 59/2021 in CP (IB) No. 305/BB/2019 are disposed of by separate orders. Post the Give on obvolved.

MEMBER (T)

MEMBER (J)

Brunda

BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL BENGALURU BENCH

I.A.No.58/2021 in C.P. (IB) No.305/BB/2019 U/s. 60(5) (B0 & (c) of the I&B Code, 2016 R/w Rule 11 of the NCLT Rules, 2016

Between:

M/s. Puravankara Limited

130/1, Ulsoor Road, Bangalore - 560 042

Applicant

AND

M/s. Kotak Mahindra Bank Limited

27 BKC, G Block, C-27 Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East) <u>Mumbai – 400 051</u> & 2 Ors.

Respondent

Pronouncement of Order: 19th March, 2021

Coram: 1. Hon'ble Shri Rajeswara Rao Vittanala, Member (Judicial)

2. Hon'ble Shri Ashutosh Chandra, Member (Technical)

Parties/Counsels Present (through Video Conference):

For the Applicant

Mr. K. Anandarama

For the Respondent

Ms. Anisha Aatresh

ORDER

Per: Rajeswara Rao Vittanala, Member (J)

1. I.A.No.58/2021 in C.P. (IB) No.305/BB/2019 is filed by M/s. Puravankara Limited, ('Applicant/Financial Creditor), U/s. 60(5) (b) &

Page 1 of 4

- (c) of the I&B Code, 2016 R/w Rule 11 of the NCLT Rules, 2016 by inter-alia seeking to set aside the decision of the RP keeping the claim of the Applicant in abeyance, communicated to the Applicant vide email dated 30.12.2020 etc.
- 2. Brief facts of the case, which are relevant to the issue in question, are as follows:
 - (1) Initially, the main Petition bearing C.P. (IB)No.305/BB/2019 filed by M/s. Kotak Mahindra Bank Limited (Petitioner) was admitted by the Adjudicating Authority, vide its Order dated 31.01.2020, by initiating CIRP in respect of the Corporate Debtor, appointing Mr. Pankaj Srivastava as IRP, imposing moratorium etc. In pursuant to the aforesaid order, the IRP caused a public announcement dated 06.02.2020 in Deccan Herald calling up on the creditors of CD to submit their claims on or before 21.02.2020. In response to the public announcement, the Applicant submitted its claim in Form C dated 18.02.2020.
 - Accordingly, IRP constituted a COC in respect of Project Arun Auroville on 02.03.2020. When it was sought to be changed, Kotak Mahindra Bank (Financial Creditor) questioned it by filing I.A Nos. 187 and 195/2020 before this Adjudicating Authority by inter-alia seeking to setting aside the decision of the IRP in constituting the COC for the entity and consequently, restore the COC as constituted on 02.03.2020, which was allowed by an order dated 29.06.2020. In pursuant to the order dated 29.06.2020, the IRP constituted the COC, thereby restoring the COC as constituted on 02.03.2020. And thereafter, the new RP again want to reverse the decision again by observing that the claims received in pursuant to the public announcement pertain not only to the project Arun project by name another Auroville also but

Kausthuba/Parkwoods, wherein also the Corporate Debtor had committed default to its Creditors and the claim of the Applicant pertains to the Project Arun Kausthuba/Parkwoods. Therefore, Resolution professional earlier filed IA No.515 of 2020 by interalia seeking to permit the RP to continue a COC for Project Arun Prakwoods, an independent real estate project of Corporate Debtor, contrary to decision of the Adjudicating Authority. Since RP was erroneous and contrary to decision of the Adjudicating Authority, the RP withdrawn it, and thus it was dismissed by an order dated 21st. December, 2020.

- (3) In spite of knowing all the developments takes place in the case, the Applicant resorted to filing this Application in order to mislead the Adjudicating Authority.
- 3. Heard Shri K Anandarama, learned Counsel for the Applicant and Ms. Anisha Aatresh, learned Counsel for the Respondent. We have carefully perused the pleadings of the Parties and also extant provisions of the Code and Rules made thereunder and various orders passed by the Adjudicating Authority in the case.
- 4. As detailed supra, the common order dated 29th June, 2020 passed in I.A Nos. 187 & 195 of 2020 has become final, and thus it is binding on all the Parties including the Applicant herein. And the present Application is filed on misconceived facts, and it is misleading. The Applicant is estopped from filing the Application. Therefore, the present Application is also liable to be dismissed.
- 5. In the result, **I.A. No.58/2021** in C.P. (IB) No.305/BB/2019 is hereby rejected as devoid of merits. The Resolution Professional is directed to follow all the orders passed by the Adjudicating Authority, which

₽age **3** of **4**

includes the common order dated 29.06.2020 passed in I.A Nos. 187 and 195 of 2020, without fail. No order as to costs.

(ASHUTOSH CHANDRA) MEMBER, TECHNICAL

(RAJESWARA RAO VITTANALA) MEMBER, JUDICIAL

Brunda

BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL BENGALURU BENCH

I.A.No.59/2021 in C.P. (IB) No.305/BB/2019 U/s. 60(5) (B0 & (c) of the I&B Code, 2016 R/w Rule 11 of the NCLT Rules, 2016

Between:

M/s. Kenstream Ventures LLP

130/1, Ulsoor Road, Bangalore – 560 042

Applicant

And

M/s. Kotak Mahindra Bank Limited

27 BKC, G Block, C-27
Bandra Kurla Complex,
Bandra (East)

<u>Mumbai – 400 051</u> & 2 Ors.

Respondent

Pronouncement of Order: 19th March, 2021

Coram: 1. Hon'ble Shri Rajeswara Rao Vittanala, Member (Judicial)

2. Hon'ble Shri Ashutosh Chandra, Member (Technical)

Parties/Counsels Present (through Video Conference):

For the Applicant

Mr. K. Anandarama

For the Respondent

Ms. Anisha Aatresh

ORDER

Per: Rajeswara Rao Vittanala, Member (J)

 I.A.No.59/2021 in C.P. (IB) No.305/BB/2019 is filed by M/s. Puravankara Limited, ('Applicant/Financial Creditor), U/s. 60(5) (b) &

4 m

Page 1 of 4

- (c) of the I&B Code, 2016 R/w Rule 11 of the NCLT Rules, 2016 by inter-alia seeking to set aside the decision of the RP keeping the claim of the Applicant in abeyance, communicated to the Applicant vide email dated 30.12.2020 etc.
- 2. Brief facts of the case, which are relevant to the issue in question, are as follows:
 - (1) Initially, the main Petition bearing C.P. (IB)No.305/BB/2019 filed by M/s. Kotak Mahindra Bank Limited (Petitioner) was admitted by the Adjudicating Authority, vide its Order dated 31.01.2020, by initiating CIRP in respect of the Corporate Debtor, appointing Mr. Pankaj Srivastava as IRP, imposing moratorium etc. In pursuant to the aforesaid order, the IRP caused a public announcement dated 06.02.2020 in Deccan Herald calling up on the creditors of CD to submit their claims on or before 21.02.2020. In response to the public announcement, the Applicant submitted its claim in Form C dated 18.02.2020.
 - (2)Accordingly, IRP constituted a COC in respect of Project Arun Auroville on 02.03.2020. When it was sought to be changed, Kotak Mahindra Bank (Financial Creditor) questioned it by filing I.A Nos. 187 and 195/2020 before the Adjudicating Authority by inter-alia seeking to setting aside the decision of the IRP in constituting the COC for the entity and consequently, restore the COC as constituted on 02.03.2020, which was allowed by an order dated 29.06.2020. In pursuant to the order dated 29.06.2020, the IRP constituted the COC, thereby restoring the COC as constituted on 02.03.2020. And thereafter, the new RP again want to reverse the decision again by observing that the claims received in pursuant to the public announcement pertain not only to the project Arun Auroville but also. another project by name Arun



Kausthuba/Parkwoods, wherein also the Corporate Debtor had committed default to its Creditors and the claim of the Applicant pertains to the Project Parkwoods. Therefore, Resolution professional earlier filed IA No.515 of 2020 by interalia seeking to permit the RP to continue a COC for Project Arun Prakwoods, an independent real estate project of Corporate Debtor, contrary to decision of the Adjudicating Authority. Since RP was erroneous and contrary to decision of the Adjudicating Authority, the RP withdrawn it, and thus it was dismissed by an order dated 21st. December, 2020.

- In spite of knowing all the developments takes place in the case, the Applicant resorted to filing this Application in order to mislead the Adjudicating Authority.
- Heard Shri K Anandarama, learned Counsel for the Applicant and 3. Ms. Anisha Aatresh, learned Counsel for the Respondent. We have carefully perused the pleadings of the Parties and also extant provisions of the Code and Rules made thereunder and various orders passed by the Adjudicating Authority in the case.
- As detailed supra, the common order dated 29th June, 2020 passed in 4. I.A Nos. 187 & 195 of 2020 has become final, and thus it is binding on all the Parties including the Applicant herein. And the present Application is filed on misconceived facts, and it is misleading. The Applicant is estopped from filing the Application. Therefore, the present Application is also liable to be dismissed.
- In the result, I.A. No.59/2021 in C.P. (IB) No.305/BB/2019 is hereby 5. rejected as devoid of merits. The Resolution Professional is directed to follow all the orders passed by the Adjudicating Authority, which

Page 3 of 4

includes the common order dated 29.06.2020 passed in I.A Nos. 187 and 195 of 2020, without fail. No order as to costs.

Sus

(ASHUTOSH CHANDRA) MEMBER, TECHNICAL (RAJESWARA RAO VITTANALA) MEMBER, JUDICIAL

Brunda

