

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**R/FIRST APPEAL NO. 531 of 1986****With****R/FIRST APPEAL NO. 1093 of 1987**

=====

HOUSE OF DUBARY**Versus****THE OFFICER LIQUIDATOR OF HANSPA KNIT (P) LTD.,**

=====

Appearance:

MR C B UPADHYAYA(3508) for the PETITIONER(s) No. 3,4

MR KN RAVAL(710) for the PETITIONER(s) No. 2

MR ND NANAVATI(507) for the PETITIONER(s) No. 1

MR ABHIJIT P JOSHI(1330) for the RESPONDENT(s) No. 1

MR PRANAV G DESAI(290) for the RESPONDENT(s) No. 6

MR SH SANJANWALA(729) for the RESPONDENT(s) No. 7

MS PJ DAVAWALA(240) for the RESPONDENT(s) No. 1

NOTICE NOT RECD BACK(3) for the RESPONDENT(s) No. 2,3

NOTICE SERVED(4) for the RESPONDENT(s) No. 4,5,8

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.M.THAKER**and****HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. B. MAYANI****Date : 14/12/2018****ORAL ORDER****(PER : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.M.THAKER)**

From the record, it appears that First Appeal No.1093 of 1987 is filed by Official Liquidator against the decree passed by learned trial Court.

Mr. Joshi, learned advocate is present.

Official Liquidator is not present.

Upon inquiry by the Court, Mr. Joshi, learned advocate informed the Court that Official Liquidator is on official leave.

We requested Mr. Joshi, learned advocate, to conduct the appeals.

Mr. Upadhyay, learned advocate and Mr. Joshi, learned advocate for Official Liquidator are still not clear as to whether one of the two appeals is actually filed by Official Liquidator, or not.

It also does not come out from the record as to whether permission from Company Court (as required under Section 446) is obtained, or not.

So as to enable learned advocates to ascertain factual aspects, we grant last opportunity with clarification that further time will not be granted.

S.O. to 21.12.2018.

(K.M.THAKER, J)

(V. B. MAYANI, J)

KAUSHIK D. CHAUHAN