

**IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL
COURT-VI, NEW DELHI BENCH**

**IA NO. 3756/PB/2020
IN
CP IB NO. 45/PB/2018**

An application under Section 60(5) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 read with Rule 11 of National Company Law Tribunal Rules, 2016.

IN THE MATTER OF:

M/S NUPUR FINVEST PRIVATE LIMITED

...FINANCIAL CREDITOR

VERSUS

M/S UNNATI FORTUNE HOLDINGS LIMITED

...CORPORATE DEBTOR

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

NEW OKHLA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Main Administrative Building, Sector-6,
Noida, Gautam Buddha Nagar,
Uttar Pradesh

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. M/S NUPUR FINVEST PRIVATE LIMITED

101, CSC, Pocket 52, CR Park,
Near Police Station, New Delhi-110019

...FINANCIAL CREDITOR/RESPONDENT NO. 1

2. M/S UNNATI FORTUNE HOLDINGS LIMITED

1103-B, Hailey Road, Connaught Place,
New Delhi-110001

...CORPORATE DEBTOR/RESPONDENT NO. 2

3. SANJAY GUPTA

E-10/A, Kailash Colony,
Greater Kailash-I, New Delhi-110048

...RESOLUTION PROFESSIONAL/RESPONDENT NO. 3

Order Delivered on: 12.01.2026

CORAM:

**JUSTICE JYOTSNA SHARMA
HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

**MS. ANU JAGMOHAN SINGH
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

APPEARANCES:

For the Applicant/NOIDA : Adv. Abdhesh Chaudhary, Adv. Vinayak Mishra, Adv. Geetanjali Setia

For the RP : Mr. Sanjay Gupta, RP in person, Mr. Sandeep Vij, Adv.

ORDER

1. The present I.A. No. 3756 of 2020 is an application filed under Section 60(5) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 ("**Code**") along with Rule 11 of the NCLT, Rules, 2016. The present application is preferred on behalf of New Okhla Industrial Development Authority- hereinafter referred to as "NOIDA" ("**Applicant**"), seeking direction to the IRP/RP to remove plot of land located at Housing Plot No. GH-002, Sector 119, NOIDA, U.P. from the pool of assets of the Corporate Debtor and declaration that the Corporate Debtor does not have any right over the property.
2. The Applicant has made the following prayers in the application:
 - a) *Direct the IRP/RP to remove the Plot of land located at Housing Plot No. GH-002, Sector 119, NOIDA, U.P. from the pool of assets of the Corporate Debtor.*
 - b) *Declare that the Corporate Debtor does not have any rights over the Plot of Land situated at Housing Plot No. GH-002, Sector 119, NOIDA, U.P.;*
 - c) *Pass any other relief or reliefs as this Hon'ble Tribunal deems fit in the nature of justice, equity and good conscience.*

Contentions of the Applicant

3. Briefly stated the facts of the case as mentioned in the instant application, which are just and necessary for adjudication, are as follows:
 - (i) That the Applicant/NOIDA (a statutory authority) entered into a Lease Deed dated 23.03.2007 (hereinafter referred to as "Lease Deed") with M/s IVRCL Limited, formerly

known as M/s IVRCL Infrastructure & Projects Limited (hereinafter referred to as “Lessee”) whereby the Applicant had leased a plot of land admeasuring 72594 sq. mtrs, located at Housing Plot No. GH-002, Sector 119, NOIDA, U.P. (hereinafter referred to as “said property/property in question”) for residential purposes for a premium of Rs. 104,53,87,200/- (Rupees One Hundred Four Crores Fifty-Three Lacs Eighty-Seven Thousand and Two Hundred) to be paid in instalments as per the terms of the Lease Deed.

- (ii) Out of the aforesaid sum of Rs. 104,53,87,200/-, the Lessee had made the payment of Rs. 41,87,28,000/- (Rupees Forty-One Crores Eighty-Seven Lacs Twenty-Eight Thousand) to the Applicant/NOIDA. Further, as per the terms of the Lease Deed, the balance amount of Rs. 62,66,59,200/- (Rupees Sixty-Two Crores Sixty-Six Lacs Fifty-Nine Thousand and Two Hundred) was to be paid by the Lessee in instalments along with interest @ 11% p.a. compounded every half yearly from the date of allotment.
- (iii) That vide Lease Deed dated 23.03.2007, the NOIDA granted exclusive rights to the Lessee to construct, develop, marketing of developer allocation, operate and maintain the project. However, in absolute violation of the terms of the Lease Deed, the IVRCL Limited executed a General Development Agreement (GDA) dated 31.10.2011 whereby, the IVRCL Limited transferred the development rights of the property in question to Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited (Corporate Debtor/Developer) in accordance with the plans/specifications to be approved/sanctioned by the Applicant/NOIDA.
- (iv) That as per the terms of the Lease Deed dated 23.03.2007, the Lessee was not authorized to transfer the property under any circumstances and the permission to transfer the property or Built-Up area could have been granted by the Applicant/NOIDA only after a Tripartite Lease Deed was executed between the Applicant, Lessee and the Transferee in the form as prescribed by the Applicant subject to the terms and conditions laid down in the Lease Deed. Therefore, the aforesaid GDA dated 31.10.2011 granting exclusive development rights to Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited (Corporate Debtor/Developer) is not valid in law and is in violation of the terms of the Lease Deed.

- (v) It is submitted that in furtherance of the terms of the original Lease Deed dated 23.03.2007, a Sub-Lease Deed dated 27.11.2015 was entered into between the Applicant/NOIDA, IVRCL Limited and IVRCL Aranya Projects Private Limited, a 95% owned subsidiary of IVRCL Limited (hereinafter referred to as “IVRCL Aranya”) wherein, the payment obligations of IVRCL Limited were transferred to IVRCL Aranya Projects Private Limited (Sub-Lessee). However, it was stated in the Sub-Lease that all the conditions of the original Lease Deed dated 23.03.2007 shall remain unchanged.
- (vi) It is submitted that in reference to Sub-Lease, it was IVRCL Aranya (Sub-Lessee) and not Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited who entered into Tripartite Lease Deed with the Applicant/NOIDA and Lessee/IVRCL Limited. Therefore, it was the Sub-Lessee (IVRCL Aranya) and not the Lessee (IVRCL Limited) who had the option to get the property or built up area transferred. However, in violation of the terms of the Lease Deed, the IVRCL Limited (Lessee) granted development rights to Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited (Corporate Debtor) by virtue of GDA dated 31.10.2011.
- (vii) That Section 18(f) of the I& B Code, 2016 (“Code”) prohibits the Interim Resolution Professional to take control of the assets of the Corporate Debtor which are owned by third party. Further, the said property cannot form part of the liquidation estate of the Corporate Debtor as per Section 36(4)(a) of the Code.

4. No reply has been filed by the Respondent No. 1 i.e. M/s Nupur Finvest Private Limited.

Contentions of the Respondent No. 3/Resolution Professional

5. The Respondent No. 3 (Resolution Professional of M/s Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited i.e. the Corporate Debtor/Respondent No. 2) has filed reply to the averments of the Applicant. The submissions made by the Respondent No. 3 are stated in brief as follows:

- (i) That the Lease Deed was executed on 23.03.2007 and the same stands valid and enforceable till date and is not rescinded. Further, the GDA was executed

on 31.10.2011 through which, although the lease rights were not transferred in favor of the Corporate Debtor. However, the development rights in respect of the leasehold property were transferred to the Corporate Debtor.

- (ii) That on 18.02.2016, the Applicant/NOIDA sent a Letter addressed to IVRCL Aranya wherein the sub-lease or the development of the project by the Corporate Debtor was acknowledged by the Applicant/NOIDA.
- (iii) That in light of the execution of the GDA, the Corporate Debtor effected payments aggregating to Rs. 30.88 Crore during the period from 01.02.2013 to 07.01.2017 to the NOIDA towards Lease Premium even though under the terms of the Sub-Lease Deed, the liability to discharge such dues had been transferred to IVRCL Aranya. The said payments were duly accepted by the NOIDA without any objection and were duly acknowledged by both NOIDA and IVRCL Aranya. It is submitted that the details of such payments duly reflected in the ledgers and bank statements of the Corporate Debtor. Further, the total payment made by IVRCL and Corporate Debtor to the NOIDA is to the tune of Rs. 1,28,78,56,071/-. The Resolution Professional sent a Letter dated 28.08.2023 to the NOIDA detailing about the payments made by the Corporate Debtor to NOIDA. The same has been placed on record as Document 7 along with affidavit dated 26.09.2023 filed by the Resolution Professional.
- (iv) That pursuant to the Meeting held on 26.04.2017 between the Allottees of the Corporate Debtor, the Corporate Debtor and the NOIDA, the NOIDA categorically directed the Corporate Debtor to address and resolve the grievances of the allottees pertaining to the timely completion of the Project, namely 'The Aranya' and to ensure the peaceful handover of possession of the respective units to the Allottees of the Corporate Debtor. The said direction demonstrates that the NOIDA had full awareness of the execution of the GDA.
- (v) That the housing project of the Corporate Debtor, namely "The Aranya" -Phase I and Phase II have been registered with UP RERA since 13.04.2013 and 02.04.2014 respectively and the name of the Promoter under both the registrations is the name of the Corporate Debtor. Further, the registration certificate is available on the website of UP RERA since April 2013 and April 2014 respectively which thereby acknowledges the development rights of the

Corporate Debtor. Therefore, it is impossible that the Applicant was unaware of the execution of the GDA with IVRCL Limited

- (vi) That the construction of Phase I and II of the Project “The Aranya” was carried forward and stands completed to nearly 90%. Possession of units was handed over to allottees through Fit-Out Letters after securing all requisite statutory approvals, including Fire Safety and Structural Stability Certificates, as well as clearances for the Sewage and Water Treatment Plants. In addition, a permanent electricity connection was procured and additional lifts were installed in eight towers, thereby enhancing habitability. It is submitted that in order to run the Corporate Debtor as a going concern, the Resolution Professional has handed over 850 units to allottees on a fit-in and fit-out basis as on date, out of which more than 150 allottees created further interest in their flats/units. Further submitting that approximately 800 allottees secured the electricity connection in their respective flats/units, and they are residing with their families.
- (vii) That subsequent to the initiation of the CIRP, the NOIDA continued to grant necessary permissions and approvals to the Corporate Debtor in relation to the Project, including clearances for the Sewage Treatment Plant, Road Cutting activities, and other statutory requirements essential for the completion and functioning of ‘The Aranya’ project. The grant of such permissions, even after the filing of the present proceedings, unequivocally evidences the acquiescence and acknowledgment by the NOIDA of the Corporate Debtor’s role as the lawful Development Right holder of the Project.
- (viii) That in view of the aforesaid submissions, the Applicant is estopped from disputing the validity of GDA whereby, the development rights of the said property were transferred to the Corporate Debtor. It is further submitted that if the Applicant had any objections to the GDA and non-execution of the tripartite agreement, they would have not granted the sanctions vide letter dated 18.02.2016. However, the Applicant had not raised any objection at the earlier stage and it is only after the initiation of the CIRP of the Corporate Debtor on 27.03.2019, the Applicant has moved the present application.

- (ix) That the execution of the GDA does not have any implication on the interest of the Applicant. Further, the Corporate Debtor is willing to ensure that the successful Resolution Applicant completes the project in line with the terms of the Lease Deed and the GDA.
 - (x) That for the purpose of completion of Project Aranya, it is imminent that the GDA is not terminated and the lease of the land is not cancelled. In case the lease of land is cancelled on account of a mere technicality under the Lease Agreement, the primary asset for completion of Project Aranya will not be available and completion of the project would become impossible which will hamper the interests of the homebuyers who had made a substantial amount of payment to receive their flats and will also be detrimental to all the stakeholders of the Corporate Debtor.
 - (xi) That in the event of the termination/cancellation of the Lease Deed, the Corporate Debtor will not be having any substantial assets in its name and therefore, no Resolution Applicant will be interested in investing in taking over the Corporate Debtor. As a result, the resolution of insolvency of the Corporate Debtor will not be achieved.
6. It is noted that the Resolution Professional has filed an Additional Affidavit dated 24.07.2025 stating that the project 'The Aranya' has achieved approximately 90% of its completion and that payments made by the Corporate Debtor (Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited towards Lease Premium from 01.02.2013 to 07.01.2017 have been received by NOIDA. In response to the submissions made by the Resolution Professional vide Additional Affidavit dated 24.09.2025, the Applicant/NOIDA has filed a Counter Affidavit dated 17.09.2025 whereby, the NOIDA had taken a stand that mere routing of payments through IVRCL's account or under its name does not constitute NOIDA's consent to such an illegal arrangement and the same cannot be deemed to confer legitimacy on the arrangement which is in violation of the requirement of mandatorily entering into the Tripartite Agreement with NOIDA. The Applicant further submitted that the alleged payments neither bind the Applicant/NOIDA to the illegal GDA nor create any privity of contract between the Applicant and the Corporate Debtor.

Analysis & Findings

7. We have gone through the documents on record filed by the Applicant and the Respondent No. 3 and heard the arguments advanced by counsels of the Applicant as well as the Respondent No. 3.
8. The facts are that on 23.03.2007, a lease Deed was entered into between the NOIDA (Lessor) and IVRCL Limited (Lessee) whereby the Applicant had leased a plot of land admeasuring 72594 sq. mtrs, located at Housing Plot No. GH-002, Sector 119, NOIDA, U.P. to IVRCL Limited for construction of residential building for a premium of Rs. 104,53,87,200/- to be paid in instalments. Thereafter, the IVRCL Limited entered into a General Development Agreement (GDA) dated 31.10.2011 with the IVRCL Assets & Holdings Limited and Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited, wherein the IVRCL had granted rights of development of the said property to the Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited (Corporate Debtor). Subsequently, a Sub-Lease Deed dated 27.11.2015 was executed between the NOIDA (Lessor), the IVRCL Limited (Lessee) and IVRCL Aranya wherein, the payment obligations of IVRCL Limited were transferred to IVRCL Aranya.
9. It is the submission of the Applicant/NOIDA that as per the terms of the Lease Deed dated 23.03.2007, the lessee was not authorized to transfer the property under any circumstances and the permission to transfer the property or built up space could have been granted by the Applicant only after a Tripartite Lease Deed was executed between the Applicant, Lessee and the Transferee. However, the IVRCL Limited without the prior intimation and permission of the Applicant, transferred the development rights of the said property to the Unnati Fortune Holdings limited by virtue of GDA dated 31.10.2011. It is further the submission of the Applicant that a Tripartite Lease Deed i.e. the Sub-lease was executed between the NOIDA, IVRCL Limited and IVRCL Aranya (Transferee). Therefore, it is the IVRCL Aranya and not the Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited who had the option to get the property or built up area transferred. Therefore, the GDA dated 31.10.2011 is in violation of the terms of the Lease Deed dated 23.03.2007.

10. It is the submission of the Resolution Professional that in furtherance of the GDA dated 31.10.2011, the Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited (Corporate Debtor) made payments to the NOIDA for a sum of Rs. 30.88 crores from 01.02.2013 to 07.01.2017 in lieu of the payment towards lease premium. In this regard, we have perused the Ledger Statement and Bank Statements of the Corporate Debtor placed on record by the Resolution Professional vide Additional Affidavit dated 24.07.2025. Importantly, on perusal of the bank statements of the Corporate Debtor, we find that payments were made by the Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited to the NOIDA during the said period. This fact has not been rebutted by the Applicant by any iota of evidence.
11. We further note that the Applicant/NOIDA has disputed the validity of the GDA for being entered into without prior intimation of the Applicant/NOIDA. In this regard, we note that pursuant to the public notice issued by the NOIDA, a meeting was held on 26.04.2017 with the buyers of the project- 'The Aranya' and the management of the Unnati Fortune Group wherein the officials of the NOIDA were also present. It is noted that in the aforesaid meeting dated 26.04.2017, the homebuyers raised their concerns with regard to the project 'The Aranya' and in response of the same, the NOIDA instructed the management of the Corporate Debtor to address the concerns of the homebuyers. The relevant extract of the meeting dated 26.04.2017 is reproduced as under:

"Presiding the meeting, Shri Shishir Singh, Additional Chief Executive Officer of Noida Authority, ACEO-(S), alongwith Shri Santosh Kumar, OSD, Shri A K Sharma, Chief Accounts Officer, Shri PL Srivastava, Chief of the Planning Department and other officials, represented Noida Authority. The Unnati Fortune Group (UFG) was represented by Mr. Anil Mithas, CMD, Mr. Vinod Chaswal, Director, and other office bearers of UFG. The homebuyer representation was recorded by the attendance of the buyers by Noida Authority.

.....

The buyers raised inter alia, the following issues to being about transparency regarding the reasons for the delay in delivery of flats by UFG:

.....

12. Thus, the documents disclose that not only NOIDA participated in the meeting of homebuyers with the management of the Corporate Debtor, rather NOIDA expressly directed the management of the Corporate Debtor to take active steps to resolve the concerns of the homebuyers. The aforesaid documents are clearly indicative of acknowledgement by the Applicant/NOIDA with regard to the role of Corporate Debtor as the Developer of the housing project.
13. We note that in this case, the GDA dated 31.10.2011 was executed by which the development rights of the property in question were transferred by IVRCL Limited (Transferor/Original Lessee) to Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited (Developer/Corporate Debtor). Subsequently, on 27.11.2015, a Sub-Lease Deed was entered into between NOIDA, IVRCL Limited and IVRCL Aranya Projects Private Limited wherein, the payment obligations of IVRCL Limited were transferred to IVRCL Aranya Projects Private Limited. The Applicant/NOIDA has not raised any dispute regarding the deed dated 27.11.2015. Hence, we do not find any utility of this paper except for the plea raised by the Applicant that the IVRCL Aranya Projects Private Limited (a subsidiary company of M/s IVRCL Limited) is the company who has the authority to allot the land/dwelling units to the ultimate beneficiary i.e. the allottees. This plea has been raised on the basis of a clause in the original lease deed dated 23.03.2007 (entered into between NOIDA Authority and IVRCL Limited) which speaks of a tripartite agreement with regard to allotment of the dwelling units/apartments. In our view, if the original lease deed is read in toto, it is clear that the tripartite agreement was always meant for the final allotment of the units to the buyers and not for any arrangement for the development works. At the cost of repetition, we refer to the argument of the NOIDA again that there have been terms and conditions in the lease deed dated 23.03.2007, which provided for execution of a tripartite agreement and therefore, the General Development Agreement dated 31.10.2011, whereby, the development rights of the property in question were transferred without involving NOIDA and without a tripartite agreement by IVRCL Limited to Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited is invalid. The submission is that the lessee had no authority to enter into such an agreement. The NOIDA argues that no prior permission from it was ever

obtained by the parties before entering into the aforesaid Agreement dated 31.10.2011. Further that the terms and conditions of the original lease dated 23.03.2007 stand violated. Hence, the NOIDA deserves the prayers made in this application i.e. removal of the plot of land in question from the pool of Assets of the Corporate Debtor. As the agreement (GDA) is non est in law, the Corporate Debtor cannot claim any rights over the land in question, therefore, it cannot form a part of the pool of assets of the Corporate Debtor. We went through the papers on record. We are of the opinion that the NOIDA has utterly failed to point out any specific provision in the Lease Deed dated 23.03.2007 which prohibited further transfer of rights for development purposes to any other entity with or without its prior permission. Hence, these arguments do not hold water.

Having said so, even if for the sake of arguments, it is presumed that there has been violation of the terms and conditions of the original lease deed of 2007 by the lessee, there is no reason why the NOIDA/Applicant has refrained from rescinding the Lease Deed dated 23.03.2007. The lease deed was entered in the year 2007 and the GDA being assailed by way of this IA of 2020 was entered into in 2011 but till now, no legal action as regard the cancellation of Lease Deed has been undertaken. Secondly, in the above scenario, the conspicuous fact which definitely invites our attention is that the Applicant/NOIDA Authority has been accepting extension charges since 2013 and instalments of lease premium from 2014 from Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited (the Corporate Debtor herein). These facts clearly show that the Applicant never had any objection against the GDA dated 31.10.2011. Moreover, the project under question has admittedly been registered with UP RERA showing Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited as a promoter. The NOIDA never took any step for revocation of the registration which is there since last many years. The Respondent submits that the registration certificate is available on UP RERA website and this fact is very well in the knowledge of NOIDA, a fact which appears relevant and important. It is further submitted on behalf of the Respondent No. 3 that the project is nearly 90% complete and that necessary permissions and approvals were being granted by NOIDA all this while. The Respondent No. 3/Resolution Professional has forcefully argued that the prayers made in this

application by NOIDA, if granted, shall be detrimental and shall cause immense injury to the homebuyers for the reason that a majority of homebuyers have been allotted dwelling units and many homebuyers are already residing in those units and that in these circumstances, the protection of interest of innocent homebuyers is necessary. We note that nothing has come on record from the side of the Applicant to demolish the above facts. Further, there is sufficient documentary evidence showing that NOIDA even participated in the meeting with the Home Buyers in 2017. Importantly, this meeting was attended by the Addl. Chief Executive Officer, Chief accounts Officer, Chief of the Planning Department along with other office bearers of NOIDA and also by the representatives of Unnati Fortune Group. Hence, obvious conclusion is that NOIDA not only had the knowledge of GDA dated 31.10.2011 and RERA registration but also treated it as validly entered into.

14. The conduct of the Applicant post execution of deed of 2011 as evidenced from the papers on record and pleadings needs to be looked into which are as under:

- i) The RERA registration of the project in question showing Corporate Debtor as the promoter and developer since 2013 and 2014 has never been questioned.
- ii) The Applicant received payments worth Rs.30.88 crores from the Corporate Debtor/Developer as regard installment of lease premium. The total payments with regard to this project now amount to about Rs. 128 crores which include the payments made by the Developer i.e. Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited (Document 7 filed by Respondent 3).
- iii) A sanction letter dated 18.02.2016 from the Applicant denotes regular participation of the Applicant in the form of granting sanctions and necessary approvals for the project.
- iv) The meeting with the allottees in the year 2017 participated by highly placed officials of the Applicant Authority with the Corporate Debtor.
- v) The fact of 90% completion of the project and grant of possession to the allottees with regular participation of the Applicant.

We find that in respect of all the above facts the Applicant has given no evidence to rebut them.

15. We are of the opinion that that there is no substance in the pleas raised by the Applicant especially in view of the facts that the NOIDA never rescinded the original lease deed on the grounds of any supposed violation of the terms and that the NOIDA has been consistently participating in all the process/procedural formalities with regard to the project in question and that it has been accepting the lease premium from the Respondent No. 2 i.e. Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited (the Corporate Debtor and the Developer). Their conduct since after the execution of General Development Agreement dated 31.10.2011 with M/s Unnati Fortune Holdings Limited insinuates that the Applicant/NOIDA accepted and acquiesced with Respondent (No. 2)' role as the developer and promoter and never had any serious objection to such role being assigned to it irrespective of validity of the agreement. We are of the firm view that the Applicant/NOIDA is now estopped by its own conduct from questioning the same. Further, the interest of the innocent homebuyers is at stake. In light of the aforesaid observations, the application lacks merit and is therefore, liable to be dismissed.
16. Consequently, **I.A./3756/PB/2020 in CP IB No. 45/PB/2018, stands dismissed and disposed of.** No orders to cost.

Let a copy of the order be served to the parties.

Sd/-
(ANU JAGMOHAN SINGH)
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

Sd/-
(JYOTSNA SHARMA)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL: NEW DELHI
COURT-VI

ITEM No. 106
IB-45/PB/2018
IA/58/2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

M/s. Nupur Finvest Pvt. Ltd.
Vs
M/s. Unnati Fortune Holdings Ltd.

.... Petitioner

.... Respondent

Order under Section 7 of (IBC), 2016

Order delivered on 12.01.2026
HYBRID HEARING (PHYSICAL & VC)

CORAM:

JUSTICE JYOTSNA SHARMA
HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

MS. ANU JAGMOHAN SINGH
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

PRESENT:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Yashpriya Sahran, Adv.
For the Respondents :

ORDER

IA/58/2026

List with the main matter on **09.02.2026**.

Sd/-
(ANU JAGMOHAN SINGH)
MEMBER (T)

Sd/-
(JYOTSNA SHARMA)
MEMBER (J)