

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 580 of 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

PCI Ltd.

...Appellant

Versus

Central Bank of India

...Respondent

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. Abhijeet Sinha, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Prakhar Mithal, Mr. Ravi Data, Mr. Rajesh Sharma, Mr. Saurabh Kalia, Ms. Tannu Rana, Advocates.

For Respondent : Ms. Prachi Johri, Ms. Monika Shahi, Ms. Abhipsa Sahu, Advocates.

O R D E R
(Hybrid Mode)

09.04.2025: Heard learned counsel for the Appellant as well as learned counsel appearing for the Respondent. This appeal has been filed against order dated 01.04.2025, which order is as follows:

“ORDER

*Learned Counsel for the Applicant as well as Learned Senior Counsel for the Respondent are present. Heard. Written submissions have been filed on behalf of both parties. **Order reserved**”*

2. Learned counsel for the Appellant submits that Writ Petition has been filed by the Appellant before the Delhi High Court where an order was passed by the Delhi High Court on 26.03.2025. He referred to Para 10 of the order which is as follows:

“10. He submits that he will be making a request to the learned NCLT for adjourning the matter after the next

Cont’d.../

date fixed before this Court. The learned NCLT may consider the same having regard to the pendency of the present petition before this Court.”

3. Learned counsel for the Appellant submits that the order of the High Court was placed before the Adjudicating Authority for consideration and the Adjudicating Authority after hearing the argument has reserved the order and order does not reflect that there is any consideration of the order dated 26.03.2025 of the Delhi High Court.

4. When we look into Para 10 of the order of the Delhi High Court, it is submission of the Appellant that he will be making a request to the learned NCLT for adjourning the matter after the next date fixed before the Court. When the Adjudicating Authority proceeded and reserved the order, it is obvious that prayer for adjournment was not acceded to. Order having been reserved by the Adjudicating Authority, we are of the view that at this stage this appeal need not be entertained. With all contentions and remedies left open to both the parties, this appeal is dismissed.

**[Justice Ashok Bhushan]
Chairperson**

**[Barun Mitra]
Member (Technical)**

**[Arun Baroka]
Member (Technical)**

Archana/nn