



\$~9(Company)

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CO.PET. 36/2013**

RE- M/S CATMOSS RETAIL PVT. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through:

versus

.....

..... Respondent

Through: Ms Ruchi Sindhwani, Sr. St. Counsel
with Ms Megha Barara, Advocate for Official
Liquidator.

Mr Ruchir Mishra, Mr Mukesh Kr Tiwari,
Advocate for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **02.05.2022**

CA 1856/2015, CA 1857/2015

1. The learned counsel for the Official Liquidator states that no orders need to be passed in these applications at this stage as the Official Liquidator has already taken possession of the shop in question, that is, shop bearing no. 7, Budh Bazar, Station Road, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh.
2. Ms Sidhwani, states that the conduct of the concerned officers of the UP Police cannot be countenanced and therefore, liberty be granted to the Official Liquidator to revive the present application if need arises.
3. The application is disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

CA 3266/2015

4. None appears for the applicants.
5. The applicants have filed the present application, *inter alia*, praying



that the Official Liquidator be directed to de-seal the property bearing no. 1038, 3rd Floor, (1-2-3) Kuccha Natwa, Chandni Chowk, Delhi – 110006 and hand over the goods to the applicants.

6. Ms Sindhwani, states that the present application is infructuous because the Official Liquidator had not sealed the property bearing no.1038 but had sealed the property bearing no. 1037, which had subsequently been de-sealed.

7. The application is dismissed in default.

CA no.54/2017

8. The said application has become infructuous. The Official Liquidator had filed this application for taking up CA no. 1343/2016 for hearing. The said application has been disposed of and therefore, this application is infructuous. It is disposed of as such.

CA 520/2017

9. None appears on behalf of respondent nos. 2 and 3.

10. The learned counsel appearing for respondent no.1 seeks time to take instructions whether she should also appear for the said respondents.

11. At her request, list on 22.08.2022.

CA no. 826/2017

12. This is an application seeking condonation of delay in filing the reply. The same is disposed of.

CA No. 1732/2017

13. Ms Sidhwani, learned counsel appearing for the Official Liquidator seeks to withdraw the present application with liberty to file afresh. Dismissed as withdrawn.

CA No. 128/2020



14. The learned counsel appearing for Ms Ashwani Chawla (respondent no.1) seeks time to take instructions.

15. At her request, list on 22.08.2022.

CA No. 521/2020 & CA 340/2020

16. Ms Sidhwani, learned counsel for the Official Liquidator, seeks time to take instructions whether any further amounts are required to be released to these security agencies.

OLR nos. 138/2016, 204/2016, 205/2016, 276/2016, 260/2017, 262/2017

17. No further orders are required to be passed in these reports. The same are taken on record and treated as disposed of.

OLR no. 188/2019

18. The Official Liquidator has filed a report, *inter alia*, pointing out that Curo India Private Limited has not complied with the order dated 26.04.2019 and, failed to deposit the amount of ₹4,56,332/-.

19. Issue notice to Curo India Private Limited. It is further directed that in the event the amount is not deposited with the Official Liquidator before the next date of hearing, the Managing Director of Curo India Private Limited shall be personally present in Court on the next date to explain reasons for the delay.

20. List on 22.08.2022.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

MAY 2, 2022

pkv

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)