

GAHC010269472025



undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : FAO/79/2025

JAY BABA BAKRESWAR RICE MILL PRIVATE LIMITED
AN EXISTING COMPANY WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE COMPANIES ACT,
2013, HAVING ITS OFFICE AT 1413, 14TH FLOOR, DIAMOND HERITAGE, 16,
STRAND ROAD, KOLKATA-700001 REPRESENTED BY SRI PARTHO
SARATHI MONDOL, AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, S/O SUDHIR KUMAR
MONDAL, RESIDENT OF LALUNGGAON, HARA GAURI BHAWAN, VIP
ROAD, P.O. AND P.S.- GORCHUK, DIST- KAMRUP (M), ASSAM, PIN-781035

VERSUS

LUNIA MARKETING PRIVATE LIMITED
AN EXISTING COMPANY WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE COMPANIES ACT,
2013, HAVING ITS OFFICE AT 156A MAHATMA GANDHI ROAD, 3RD FLOOR,
KOLKATA- 700007 AND ALSO AT BLOCK-II, BAJRANGBALI REAL ESTATE,
PAMOHI, RAMCHARANI, KAMRUP- 781034, GUWAHATI

Advocate for the Petitioner : S K PODDAR, MS. N PODDAR, MR. C SHARMA, DARAK
ULLAH

Advocate for the Respondent : A R PAL,

Linked Case : I.A.(Civil)/4084/2025

JAY BABA BAKRESWAR RICE MILL PRIVATE LIMITED
AN EXISTING COMPANY WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE COMPANIES ACT
2013

HAVING ITS OFFICE AT 1413
14TH FLOOR
DIAMOND HERITAGE
16
STRAND ROAD
KOLKATA-700001 REPRESENTED BY SRI PARTHO SARATHI MONDOL
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
S/O SUDHIR KUMAR MONDAL
RESIDENT OF LALUNGGAON
HARA GAURI BHAWAN
VIP ROAD
P.O. AND P.S.- GORCHUK
DIST- KAMRUP (M)
ASSAM
PIN-781035

VERSUS

LUNIA MARKETING PRIVATE LIMITED
AN EXISTING COMPANY WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE COMPANIES ACT
2013
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT 156A MAHATMA GANDHI ROAD
3RD FLOOR
KOLKATA- 700007 AND ALSO AT BLOCK-II
BAJRANGBALI REAL ESTATE
PAMOHI
RAMCHARANI
KAMRUP- 781034
GUWAHATI

Advocate for : S K PODDAR
Advocate for : appearing for LUNIA MARKETING PRIVATE LIMITED

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MRIDUL KUMAR KALITA

ORDER

Date : 01.04.2026

1. Heard Mr. A. R. Paul, the learned counsel for the respondent, who seeks for an adjournment on the ground of

personal difficulty of the conducting counsel for the respondent. Also heard Mr. D. Ullah, the learned counsel for the appellant, who does not oppose the said prayer.

2. Hence, the prayer is allowed.
3. Let this matter be listed on 24.04.2026.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant