

Name of the Corporate debtor: Saptha Zeal Pvt. Ltd  
Liquidation Commencement Date: June 12, 2025  
List of stakeholders as on: August 25, 2025

**List of operational creditors (Other than Workmen, Employees and Government Dues)**

**Annexure 1.3**

(Amount in Rs.)

Sl. no.	Name of creditor	Details of claim received		Details of claim admitted						Amount of contingent claim	Amount of any mutual dues, that may be set off	Amount of claim rejected	Amount of claim under verification	Remarks
		Date of receipt	Amount claimed	Amount of claim admitted	Nature of claim	Amount covered by lien or attachment pending disposal	Whether lien / attachment removed? (Yes/No)	Amount covered by guarantee	% share in total amount of claims admitted					
1	HLL Infra Tech Services Ltd.	13/06/2024	64,828,704	-	Claim with interest arising from operational defects and excess payments	-	-	-	-	64,828,704	70,614,987	64,828,704	Nil	Note 1
2	Manjusha Indira Devi Appukuttan	10/07/2025	8,051,922	-	Guarantee commission	-	-	-	-	Nil	Nil	8,051,922	Nil	Note 2
			<b>72,880,626</b>	-		-			-			<b>72,880,626</b>		

**Note 1**

The Corporate Debtor had initiated arbitration proceedings against HLL Infra Tech Services Ltd. ('HITES') for a claim amount of Rs. 7,06,14,987 plus interest @ 18% per annum. In response to this, HITES made a counter claim of Rs. 6,48,28,704 (including interest till CIRP initiation date). HITES had submitted a claim to the erstwhile Resolution Professional while admitting that the claim was disputed. The said claim was admitted by the erstwhile Resolution Professional. HITES did not submit a fresh claim when invited to do so, following the commencement of liquidation. The Liquidator has considered their claim submitted during the CIRP period. The date of receipt of claim represents the date of its claim during the CIRP period. In view of the claim by the Corporate Debtor against HITES and the fact that arbitration proceedings have been initiated, the Liquidator has admitted HITES's claim at Rs. 0.

**Note 2**

The Liquidator has rejected this claim on the grounds that the document on which reliance has been placed by the claimant is not stamped according to stamp duty regulations. Further, there is no corroborative evidence as to the existence of such an agreement on any other documents or filings.