

IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU BENCH

[Through Physical hearing/ VC Mode (Hybrid)]

ITEM No.01

C.P. (IB) No.137/BB/2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

Mr. Deepak Kumar Gupta

... Petitioner

Vs.

M/s. Sumukha Automation Private Limited

... Respondent

Petition under Section 9 of IBC, 2016

Order delivered on: 17.09.2026

CORAM:

**SHRI SUNIL KUMAR AGGARWAL
HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

**SHRI RADHAKRISHNA SREEPADA
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

COUNSELS PRESENT:

For the Petitioner : Ms. Niyathi M.

For the Respondent : Shri Uday Shankar

ORDER

1. Heard Ld. Counsels for the parties.
2. Vide separate Order, **Respondent Company is admitted to CIRP, and moratorium is declared.**
3. List the matter on **04.11.2026**, for awaiting the IRP/RP report.

-Sd-

**RADHAKRISHNA SREEPADA
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

-Sd-

**SUNIL KUMAR AGGARWAL
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

Shruthi

IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU BENCH

*(Exercising powers of Adjudicating Authority under
The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016)
(Through Physical Hearing/ VC Mode (Hybrid))*

CP (IB) No. 137/BB/2025

U/s. 9 of the IBC, 2016 read with Rule 6 of the IBC (AAA) Rules, 2016

IN THE MATTER OF:

Deepak Kumar Gupta

(Proprietor of **M/s. Steelkart India**)

SF No.110/2, Kadapakkam Vichur Link Road,

Vichur, Chennai - 600103,

Tamil Nadu, India.

- Operational Creditor/Petitioner

VERSUS

M/s. Sumukha Automation Private Limited

Unit No. 802, 8th Floor, Brigade Rubix,

No. 20, Watch Factory Road, Phase-I,

Yeshwanthpur, Jalahalli,

Bengaluru - 560022, Karnataka.

- Corporate Debtor/Respondent

Order delivered on: 17.09.2026

CORAM:

Shri Sunil Kumar Aggarwal, Hon'ble Member (Judicial)

Shri Radhakrishna Sreepada, Hon'ble Member (Technical)

COUNSELS PRESENT

For the Petitioner : Shri Gaurav Kumar

For the Respondent : Mr. Uday Shankar & Ms. Pranjali

ORDER

1. The present Company Petition has been filed on 26.05.2025 by Mr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Proprietor of M/s. Steelkart India (hereinafter referred to as the

“Operational Creditor” or “OC”) under Section 9 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as the “Code”) read with Rule 6 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy (Application to Adjudicating Authority) Rules, 2016, seeking initiation of Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (“CIRP”) against M/s. Sumukha Automation Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as the “Corporate Debtor” or “CD”) on account of alleged default in payment of operational debt aggregating to **₹1,30,25,934/15** comprising principal outstanding of ₹1,13,28,069/60 and interest of ₹16,97,864/55 with date of default being **28.01.2025**.

2. The facts of the case as submitted by the OC, in brief, are as follows:

- a. The OC is a sole proprietorship concern carrying on business in the supply and trading of iron and steel raw materials under the name and style of M/s. Steelkart India. The CD is a company incorporated under the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 and engaged in the business of automation and engineering solutions. The present petition arises out of commercial transactions entered into between the parties in the ordinary course of business.
- b. To start their commercial dealings, the CD had approached the OC for supply of various grades of iron and steel plates and other raw materials required for its manufacturing activities. Pursuant thereto, the CD had issued several purchase orders during November 2024 specifying the quantity, specifications, grade requirements and delivery schedules for the materials required by it. The purchase orders also stipulated payment terms providing for payment within sixty days from the date of supply. The OC accepted the purchase orders and proceeded to supply the materials in accordance with the requirements of the CD.
- c. Before the commencement of supplies, correspondence was exchanged between the parties regarding payment terms. By email dated 29.11.2024, the OC had requested confirmation that payments would be

made within sixty days and that delayed payments beyond the stipulated period would attract interest. In response, the representatives of the CD acknowledged the payment terms and assured the OC that payments would be honoured, subject to a reasonable tolerance period owing to business exigencies. On the basis of such assurances and purchase orders were issued by the CD and the material was supplied by the OC.

- d. The OC had issued corresponding tax invoices from time to time. The materials supplied were accompanied by e-way bills, transport documents and delivery records evidencing movement and delivery of goods. The goods were duly received and accepted by the CD without any protest regarding quality, quantity or specifications. The OC has relied upon purchase orders, tax invoices, GST records, e-way bills, lorry receipts and email communications in support of its claim.
- e. It is the case of the OC that eight invoices bearing Nos. SKI-0066/24-25, SKI-0067/24-25, SKI-0068/24-25, SKI-0070/24-25, SKI-0071/24-25, SKI-0072/24-25, SKI-0073/24-25 and SKI-0074/24-25 were raised between 29.11.2024 and 07.12.2024 towards the materials supplied to the CD. The aggregate invoice value of the said supplies is more than ₹1.13 Crores. The invoices became due for payment upon expiry of the agreed credit period of sixty days. However, despite expiry of the stipulated period, the CD failed to honour its payment obligations.
- f. The OC asserts that the CD has not only received the goods but also acknowledged the invoices raised by the OC. The petition relies upon invoice acknowledgements and confirmations received from the CD evidencing receipt of the goods and the outstanding liability. The OC further contends that the supplies effected by it are duly reflected in statutory records and GST returns and that there is no dispute regarding the underlying transactions.

- g. According to the computation furnished along with the petition, an amount of ₹1,13,28,069.60/- remained unpaid towards the supplies made by the OC. The OC has also claimed interest amounting to ₹16,97,864.55/- on the delayed payments. Consequently, the total amount claimed as due and payable by the CD has been quantified at ₹1,30,25,934.15/-. The OC submits that the default commenced on 28.01.2025, being sixty days from the date of the earliest outstanding invoice, and continues thereafter.
 - h. It is further stated that despite repeated follow-ups and requests for payment, the CD has failed to liquidate the outstanding dues. Consequently, the OC issued a demand notice dated 06.05.2025 under Section 8 of the Code in Form-3 and Form-4 calling upon the CD to make payment of the operational debt. The demand notice was dispatched through email as well as speed post to the registered office and the directors of the CD and was duly served upon the CD.
 - i. The OC submits that neither any payment was received from the CD nor any notice of dispute issued within the statutory period prescribed under Section 8 of the Code. It is therefore, contended that the debt is due, payable and undisputed and that the CD has committed default in repayment of the operational debt. It is in these circumstances that this petition has been filed seeking initiation of CIRP against the CD under Section 9 of the Code.
3. On being notified of the petition, the CD has appeared and filed its Statement of Objections stating:
- a. The OC having failed to disclose all material facts and not approached this Adjudicating Authority with clean hands, the petition is liable to be dismissed both in law and on facts. According to the CD, the petition is founded on incomplete and suppressed facts and therefore deserves dismissal at the threshold.

- b. Although the petition was filed on 26.05.2025, notice thereof was served upon it only on 06.08.2025. The principal amount claimed in the petition stood substantially paid after filing of the petition and prior to its admission, which fact has not been disclosed by the OC.
- c. The principal defence of the CD is that the entire principal operational debt claimed in the petition has already been discharged. Against the principal claim of ₹1,13,28,069/60 of OC, payments aggregating to ₹1,13,28,069/- have been made by the CD through various transfers on 31.05.2025, 09.07.2025, 23.07.2025, 05.08.2025 and 06.08.2025. The CD has relied upon its bank statements to demonstrate that the entire principal amount claimed by the OC stood satisfied before admission of the petition. It is therefore, contended that no operational debt remains due and payable as on date and consequently the ingredients necessary for maintaining a petition under Section 9 of the Code are absent.
- d. Once the principal amount has been paid, the present petition survives only with respect to the claim of interest amounting to ₹16,97,864.55/-. Such a petition for enforcing payment only of interest is not maintainable under the provisions of the Code, particularly when there exists no agreement between the parties regarding payment of interest on delayed payments.
- e. The purchase orders issued by the CD, which constitute the contractual basis of the transactions between the parties, do not contain any stipulation regarding payment of interest. The claim for interest was sought to be introduced unilaterally by the OC through emails and invoices and was never accepted by the CD. With reference to email dated 29.11.2024 relied upon by the OC, it is explained that while the OC sought interest at the rate of 2% per month on delayed payments, the invoices allegedly mention interest at the rate of 3% per month, thereby demonstrating inconsistency even in the OC's own claim. In its response to the said email, the CD had categorically stated that payment terms

contained in the purchase orders would govern the transactions and that the purchase orders did not provide for payment of interest. Therefore, there was never any concluded agreement regarding levy of interest.

- f. Further, any stipulation regarding interest contained in invoices cannot be treated as binding upon it since the invoices are unilateral documents generated by the supplier after supply of goods and do not constitute mutually agreed contractual terms. In the absence of an express contractual agreement regarding interest, the OC cannot invoke the provisions of the Code solely for recovery of an alleged interest component.
- g. The determination of OC's entitlement to interest would necessarily require adjudication of disputed questions regarding the contractual arrangement between the parties, interpretation of purchase orders, invoices and correspondence exchanged between them. Such issues, according to the CD, require a detailed trial and cannot be adjudicated in summary proceedings under Sections 8 and 9 of the Code.
- h. The CD has further submitted that even assuming the interest claim is maintainable, the amount claimed towards interest alone is less than the statutory threshold of ₹1 crore prescribed under the Code. Consequently, once the principal amount is excluded on account of payment, the petition would fail to satisfy the minimum threshold requirement necessary for initiation of CIRP.
- i. Reliance has been placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble National Company Law Appellate Tribunal in ***S.S. Polymers v. Kanodia Technoplast Limited, Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 1227 of 2019***, wherein it was held that where the principal debt has been paid before admission of a Section 9 application and the proceedings are pursued only for realization of interest, such proceedings would be

contrary to the scheme of the Code. The CD contends that the ratio of the said judgment squarely applies to the facts of the present case.

- j. The CD has also relied upon the decision of the Hon'ble National Company Law Tribunal, New Delhi Bench in ***Saraf Chits Private Limited v. KAD Housing Private Limited***, CP (IB) No. 255 (ND) of 2021, to convey that CIRP cannot be initiated solely for recovery of unpaid interest where the principal debt has already been discharged. According to the CD, the present petition falls squarely within the said principle and is therefore liable to be rejected.
- k. The CD has additionally asserted that it is a solvent and financially sound company. It generates annual revenue of approximately ₹48 crores, possesses a net worth of around ₹25 crores and employs a substantial workforce directly and indirectly. The fact that the entire principal amount claimed by the OC has been paid, according to the CD, itself demonstrates its financial capability and solvency. The initiation of CIRP against a commercially viable and solvent company for a disputed claim of interest would defeat the very object and purpose of the Code.
- l. Lastly, the CD contends that the OC is attempting to utilise the provisions of the Code as a recovery mechanism. Despite receiving substantial payments from the CD after filing of the petition, the OC has continued with the proceedings without placing the subsequent payments before this Adjudicating Authority. According to the CD, the present proceedings are intended only to recover money and interest and not for resolution of insolvency. On these grounds, the CD has sought dismissal of the petition with exemplary costs.

4. The OC has filed Rejoinder in the matter taking following pleas:

- a. The petition has been filed with complete disclosure of all material facts and that the objections raised by the CD are misconceived both in law and on facts. The maintainability of an application under Section 9 of

the Code, including the requirement of the minimum threshold prescribed under Section 4, has to be examined with reference to the date of filing of the application. According to the OC, on the date of filing of the present petition, i.e. 26.05.2025, the total operational debt due and payable was ₹1,30,25,934.15/-, comprising principal and interest, which was well above the statutory threshold prescribed under the Code. Any payments made by the CD subsequent thereto cannot defeat an otherwise maintainable insolvency application. In support of said proposition, reliance has been placed upon the judgments in ***Rajahmundry Electric Supply Corporation Ltd. v. A. Nageswara Rao & Ors.*** 1956 AIR 213 1955 SCR (2) 1066, ***Manish Kumar v. Union of India*** (2021) 5 SCC 1, and ***Hyline Mediconz Private Limited v. Anandaloke Medical Centre Private Limited, Company Appeal (AT) (Ins) No. 1036 of 2022.***

- b. The petition cannot be characterised as a proceeding instituted solely for recovery of interest. It was filed for recovery of the entire outstanding debt amounting to ₹1,30,25,934.15/-, out of which the subsequent payment of principal amount during the pendency of Petition does not alter the nature of claim as it existed on the date of filing of the petition.
- c. The OC has disputed that there was no agreement regarding payment of interest. In fact, the CD had acknowledged its liability towards interest and subsequently sought waiver thereof. Reference to an email dated 06.08.2025 is made in this behalf, wherein the CD had requested waiver of the interest component on account of financial difficulties. The said communication amounts to an unequivocal acknowledgment of liability towards interest and is inconsistent with the stand now taken by the CD that no interest was ever payable.
- d. Even during the proceedings before this Adjudicating Authority, the principal amount of ₹1,13,28,069/- came to be paid by the CD and that negotiations were ongoing between the parties regarding the remaining

claim. The payment of the principal amount during the pendency of the proceedings constitutes an acknowledgment of debt and default by the CD which existed on the date of filing of the petition.

- e. With regard to the plea of solvency or financial soundness raised by the CD is concerned, they are irrelevant for the purpose of initiation of CIRP under the Code. The trigger for commencement of insolvency proceedings is the existence of debt and default and not the overall financial position of the CD. Reliance in this behalf has been placed on the decision of the Hon'ble NCLAT in ***Sodexo India Services Pvt. Ltd. v. Chemizol Additives Pvt. Ltd. Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1094 of 2020.***
 - f. The OC has refuted that the present proceedings constitute a recovery action. The petition was necessitated by the failure of the CD to discharge its admitted liabilities despite repeated demands and issuance of the statutory demand notice. The OC therefore prays that the objections raised by the CD be rejected and the present petition be admitted.
5. The learned Counsel appearing for the OC has relied upon the following decisions:
- i. ***Devika Resources Pvt. Ltd. (formerly known as Kalinga Enterprises Pvt. Ltd.) v. MAA Manasha Devi Alloys Pvt. Ltd., Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 938 of 2024, decided on 14.05.2025,*** wherein the Hon'ble NCLAT has held that the threshold prescribed under Section 4 of the Code is required to be examined with reference to the date of filing of the application and not the date of admission. It was further held that subsequent payment made during the pendency of the proceedings reducing the outstanding amount below the statutory threshold would not render the application non-maintainable.

- ii. ***Omshree Agro Tech Private Limited v. Kasturi Farm Private Limited***, CP (IB) No. 1099/MB/2025, order dated 17.03.2026, wherein the Mumbai Bench of the NCLT, relying upon the judgment of the Hon'ble NCLAT in ***Devika Resources Pvt. Ltd.***, held that the threshold under Section 4 of the Code is to be assessed on the date of filing of the application and not on the date of admission. The Tribunal observed that part-payments made by the CD during the pendency of the proceedings would not affect the maintainability of an otherwise valid application.
 - iii. In ***Mangal Sales Corporation v. Prolific Papers Private Limited***, CP (IB) No. 429/ND/2024, order dated 09.04.2026, New Delhi Bench of Hon'ble NCLT, placing reliance on ***Devika Resources Pvt. Ltd.***, reiterated that subsequent payments made after filing of a Section 9 application, even if resulting in reduction of the outstanding debt below the statutory threshold, would not defeat the maintainability of the proceedings.
6. The OC has therefore contended that the maintainability of the present petition has to be examined with reference to the debt and default existing on the date of filing of the petition and that subsequent payments made by the CD during the pendency of the proceedings cannot defeat the insolvency proceedings validly initiated under Section 9 of the Code.
7. We have heard the Learned Counsels for the Operational Creditor and Corporate Debtor and perused the material on record.
8. The present petition was filed on 26.05.2025 claiming an operational debt of ₹1,30,25,934.15/-, comprising principal outstanding of ₹1,13,28,069.60/- and interest of ₹16,97,864.55/-. The respondent was served with advance notice of the petition through email on 26.05.2025 itself. The payments relied upon by the CD admittedly are all subsequent to the filing of the petition, between 31.05.2025 till 06.08.2025. The claimed debt, therefore, was fully outstanding on the date of institution of the petition.

9. The question - whether the threshold prescribed under Section 4 of the Code is required to be examined on the date of filing of the application or on the date of hearing on admission finds answer in afore-cited ***Devika Resources Pvt. Ltd. v. MAA Manasha Devi Alloys Pvt. Ltd.*** rendered by Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal.
10. The aforesaid principle has subsequently been followed in ***Omsfree Agro Tech Pvt. Ltd. v. Kasturi Farm Pvt. Ltd.*** and ***Mangal Sales Corporation v. Prolific Papers Pvt. Ltd.***, wherein it was reiterated that maintainability is to be tested with reference to the debt and default existing on the date of institution of the proceedings and not on the basis of subsequent events.
11. Applying the aforesaid principles to the facts of the present case, we find that on the date of filing of the petition, namely 26.05.2025, the operational debt claimed by the OC was ₹1,30,25,934.15/-, which was well above the threshold prescribed under Section 4 of the Code. The CD having paid amounts during pendency of petition cannot non-suit the petitioner as the statutory requirement relating to threshold stood satisfied on the date of institution.
12. The payment by CD during pendency of petition without demur or specification constitutes unequivocal acknowledgment of the underlying debt and lends support to the case of the OC that the liability claimed in the petition was due and payable on the date of filing. The subsequent payments by the CD cannot erase the debt and default that had already occurred nor can they retrospectively invalidate a petition that was otherwise maintainable on the date of its institution.
13. The OC has relied upon the email dated 06.08.2025 wherein the CD has sought waiver of interest component. Prima facie, such communication indicates that the CD was conscious of the outstanding claim and was seeking concession in respect thereof rather than disputing the existence of liability itself. The petitioner had made the terms of supply very clear beforehand through e-mail dated 29.11.2024 explicitly disclosing interest component, which was acknowledged by the respondent in less than 15 minutes through its e-mail

although 15-20 days tolerance in payment had been requested. The conduct of respondent in seeking waiver of interest on the date of remitting last tranche of principal amount and now altogether refuting the interest claim altogether is reprehensible being inconsistent with the stand subsequently taken that no interest liability whatsoever existed.

14. The contention that the petition has become non-maintainable because the principal amount has subsequently been paid cannot be accepted. Acceptance of such a contention would enable a defaulting CD to defeat insolvency proceedings validly instituted under the Code by making payments after commencement of proceedings, a consequence which stands contrary to the principles laid down in *Devika Resources*, *Omsree Agro Tech* and *Mangal Sales Corporation*.
15. The CD has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble NCLAT in ***S.S. Polymers v. Kanodia Technoplast Limited*** and the decision in ***Saraf Chits Private Limited v. KAD Housing Private Limited*** However, the said decisions are distinguishable on facts. This petition was not instituted merely for recovery of interest. On the date of filing, the OC had claimed principal outstanding exceeding ₹1.13 Crores plus interest and the threshold requirement stood satisfied. The subsequent payment of the principal amount during the pendency of proceedings does not alter the character of the petition as originally instituted nor does it obliterate the debt and default existing on the date of filing.
16. The plea regarding solvency of the CD (not supported by filing of any financial statements) is equally unavailing. It is well settled that the trigger for initiation of CIRP under the Code is the existence of debt and default and not the overall financial position or commercial strength of the CD. The e-mail dated 06.08.2025 of the CD, copy whereof has been filed by the OC with rejoinder, even otherwise exposes said claim to be hollow. The CD had pleaded for waiver of interest as it is undergoing financial problems and had recorded losses in its financials for 2023-24.

17. Accordingly, we are satisfied that the OC has established the existence of operational debt and default exceeding the threshold prescribed under Section 4 of the Code on the date of filing of the petition, that the statutory demand notice was duly served, and absence of tenable pre-existing dispute has been established by the CD so as to warrant rejection of the petition.
18. For the foregoing reasons, CP (IB) No. 137/BB/2025 is **allowed** and the Respondent/CD, **M/s. Sumukha Automation Private Limited**, is admitted into CIRP under Section 9 of the Code, 2016.
19. Simultaneously, moratorium is declared in terms of Section 14 of the Code imposing the following prohibitions, which shall be effective from the date of this order:
- i. The institution of suits or continuation of pending suits or proceedings against the CD including execution of any judgment, decree or order in any court of law, tribunal, arbitration panel or other authority;
 - ii. Transferring, encumbering, alienating or disposing of by the CD any of its assets or any legal right or beneficial interest therein;
 - iii. Any action to foreclose, recover or enforce any security interest created by the CD in respect of its property including any action under the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002;
 - iv. The recovery of any property by an owner or lessor where such property is occupied by or in possession of the CD.
20. It is further directed that the supply of essential goods or services to the CD, if continuing, shall not be terminated or suspended or interrupted during the moratorium period.
21. The provisions of Section 14(3) of the Code shall, however, apply to such transactions as are exempted thereunder.

22. The order of moratorium shall have effect from the date of this order till completion of the CIRP or until approval of a Resolution Plan under Section 31(1) of the Code or passing of an order for liquidation of the CD under Section 33 of the Code, as the case may be.
23. In Part III of Form-5, the OC has not proposed the name of any Insolvency Professional to act as Interim Resolution Professional and has left it to this Adjudicating Authority to appoint an Interim Resolution Professional in terms of Section 16 of the Code.
24. From the Panel of Bengaluru based Insolvency Professionals made available by the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India, PRAFULLA GURULINGAYYA MELINAMANI , Registration No. IBBI/IPA-001/IP-P-02680/2022-2023/14089 , having office at Sy No 5206/8 ,Opp Apmc Mangal Karyalaya, At Post : Jamkhandi ,Opp Apmc Mangal Karyalaya ,Bagalkot ,Karnataka ,587301 , Email: caprafullagm@gmail.com, Phone No. 9480284791 is hereby appointed as Interim Resolution Professional ("IRP") to carry out the functions contemplated under the Code, 2016 and the Regulations framed thereunder.
25. The IRP shall make a public announcement immediately with respect to initiation of CIRP concerning the CD and invite claims from all creditors in accordance with Section 15 of the Code read with the applicable Regulations.
26. The IRP shall be entitled to fee and expenses in accordance with the applicable provisions, Regulations, Circulars and Directions issued by the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India from time to time.
27. The OC shall deposit a sum of **₹2,00,000/-** (Rupees Two Lakhs Only) with the IRP within one week from the date of receipt of this order towards initial CIRP expenses. The said amount shall be subject to ratification by the Committee of Creditors ("CoC") and adjusted in accordance with law.
28. The IRP shall issue individual notices to the concerned Income Tax Authorities, GST Authorities, Employees' Provident Fund Organisation, Employees' State

Insurance Corporation, Registrar of Companies and such other statutory authorities as may be necessary and place proof of service on record along with the first progress report.

29. The IRP shall take control and custody of the assets and records of the CD, collate all claims received, determine the financial position of the CD and constitute the CoC in accordance with the provisions of the Code. A report certifying the constitution of the CoC shall be filed before this Adjudicating Authority within the period prescribed under the Code and Regulations.
30. The suspended Board of Directors, Key Managerial Personnel, officers and employees of the CD shall extend full cooperation and assistance to the IRP/RP in discharge of duties under the Code. Any obstruction or non-cooperation shall be viewed seriously and dealt with in accordance with law.
31. The IRP/RP shall submit periodic progress reports regarding conduct of CIRP before this Adjudicating Authority.
32. Upon taking over management of the CD, the IRP shall ensure that on appropriate size notice boards it be displayed at the registered office and principal place of business of the CD that the CD is undergoing CIRP together with details and contact information of the IRP, to enable them to make enquiries and for submission of claims by stakeholders.
33. A copy of this order shall be communicated to the OC, the CD, the IRP and the Registrar of Companies forthwith. The Registry is directed to forward a copy of this order through electronic mode to all concerned.

-Sd-
(RADHAKRISHNA SREEPADA)
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

-Sd-
(SUNIL KUMAR AGGARWAL)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)