



\$~C-1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CO.PET. 704/2014**

SH. AMARPREET SINGH OBEROI & ORS. Petitioner

Through : Mr.Kailash Vasudev, Sr. Adv. with
Mr.Shreyans Singhavi and Ms.Ekta
Mehta, Advs. in CA No.2089/2016
Mr.Sanjeev Kumar, Adv.

versus

M/S A. N. BUILDWELL PVT. LTD. Respondent

Through : Mr.Kunal Sharma, Adv. for OL
Ms.Yeshi Rinchhen, Adv. for ex-
directors Mr.Sunil and Mr.S.K.Hooda
Mr.Sumer Sodhi, Adv. for Manasvi
Security Agency

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YOGESH KHANNA

ORDER

% 15.09.2017

CA No.2089/2016

This application is moved by the petitioner to direct the OL to deliver possession of the premises No.504, 5th Floor, Bhikaji Cama Bhawan, New Delhi. The owner/landlord of the premises had given it on rent to the respondent company in liquidation in the year 2013. The respondent company has failed to pay rent and maintenance charges @ Rs.1,20,000/- p.m. The premises have since been sealed by the OL on 06.04.2016 and it is alleged that the moveable articles of the respondent company are lying in the premises and as such the inventory need to be prepared and moveable articles need to be valued. The counsel for ex-directors is present and accepts notice. She requests time to file reply. The reply though be filed within two weeks from today, but in the meanwhile the OL as well as the



representatives of the owner/landlord of the premises to visit the premises on 22nd September, 2017 at 2 p.m. so that an inventory of the goods be prepared and if possible the goods/articles lying in the premises may be shifted in some cabins in the said premises. The valuer may also accompany them to value the moveable articles lying therein and file a report before the next date.

The premises may be de-sealed for the aforesaid purpose and be re-sealed thereafter. Order *dasti*.

CA No.1089/2017

It pertains to the payment of Rs.46,20,006/- as security charges payable to the security agencies M/s Manasvi Security Services for the period from 06.04.2016 to 31.03.2017 and from 29.04.2016 to 31.03.2017. The security guards are employed at two of the premises of the respondent company. Since the respondent company has no funds, the payment is required to be made from the common pool fund. However the learned counsel for the ex-directors seeks revival of the company, hence notice be issued to ex-management. In case the revival scheme is accepted the respondent company shall then be liable to pay the charges. The counsel for ex-management is present and accepts notice.

List on 22nd September, 2017.

CO.PET. 704/2014

List on 11th October, 2017.

YOGESH KHANNA, J

SEPTEMBER 15, 2017/vLD