

3 On the other application of respondents that perjury proceedings be initiated against appellant, the Court has expressed a *prima-facie* view that appellant has committed perjury by filing fabricated and interpolated documents. Mr.Balsara states that against the order dated 7th April 2017 in Company Application No. 54 of 2016 which is the application to hold appellant guilty of perjury, appellant has preferred an Appeal (Lodg.) No. 232 of 2017. Mr. Bhardwaj submits that this appeal, therefore, be stood over till Appeal (lodg.) No.232 of 2017 is disposed.

Mr.Bhardwaj states that no stay has been granted and therefore, there is no bar to this Court dismissing the present Company Appeal No. 18 of 2015 because appellant has been found to have committed perjury.

4 In my view, it will not be appropriate to dispose the Company Appeal at this point of time because if by any chance, appellant succeeds in Company Appeal (Lodg.) No. 232 of 2017, then this company appeal will have to be heard. It should also be noted that copy of the Appeal has been served on respondent nos.2 and 3.

5 In the circumstances, Company Appeal No. 18 of 2015 is adjourned *sine-die*, to be taken up after disposal of Appeal (Lodg.) No. 231 of 2017.

Liberty to apply.

(K.R. SHRIRAM, J.)