

**NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI**

**Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 479 of 2019**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**Mr. Yogesh Baliram Vargantwar** **...Appellant**

**Vs.**

**M/s. Vighnaharta Health Visionaries Pvt. Ltd.** **...Respondent**

**Present: For Appellant: - Mr. Virender Ganda, Senior Advocate with Mr. P.K. Mittal, Mr. Ayandeb Mitra, Mr. Anand Singh and Ms. Shruti Choudhary, Advocates.**

**For Respondent: - Mr. Rahul Totala and Mr. Rohit Rathi, Advocates.**

**O R D E R**

**14.11.2019—** The Appellant- Dr. Yogesh Baliram Vargantwar ('Operational Creditor') filed an Application under Section 9 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 ("I&B Code" for short) for initiation of the 'Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process' against 'M/s. Vighnaharta Health Visionaries Private Limited'- ('Corporate Debtor'). The Adjudicating Authority (National Company Law Tribunal), Mumbai Bench, Mumbai, by impugned order dated 29<sup>th</sup> March, 2019 rejected the Application with following observations:

*"19. Given the Operational Creditor's averment in the rejoinder that the Corporate Debtor has acknowledged the due amount of Rs.94.41 lakhs in*

*the balance sheet as on 31.3.2017, in the absence of any document crystallising the dues of the Operational Creditor, the existence of dispute before the issuance of demand notice and the MoU being under challenge, the issue in hand requires further investigation which the Adjudicating Authority is not empowered to do.*

*20. Since the petition is filed on the basis of pre-existing dispute and the operational creditor has also failed to prove that there remains an operational debt due on the corporate debtor, which was not paid despite service of demand notice, therefore, petition filed U/S 9 of the I&B Code deserves to be dismissed.”*

2. The Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Appellant submits that both the grounds taken by the Adjudicating Authority are misconceived. There is no document to suggest pre-existing dispute with regard to the ‘operational debt’. Further, according to him, the ‘Corporate Debtor’ having acknowledged the due amount of Rs. 94.41 Lakhs in the Balance Sheet as on 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2017, no other document was required to hold that dues have crystallised.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondent- 'Corporate Debtor' relied on e-mail dated 22<sup>nd</sup> February, 2018 to suggest pre-existing dispute, which is extracted below:



387 ANNEXURE-A-14  
pradeep mittal <pkmittal171@gmail.com>

**Fwd: Fw: your e mail dated .....**

**YOGESH VARGANTWAR** <ybvargantwar@gmail.com>  
o: "Adv - P. K. Mittal" <pkmittal171@gmail.com>

Wed, Apr 24, 2019 at 2:32 F

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Rajesh Vargantwar** <vargantwar@gmail.com>  
Date: Wed, 24 Apr 2019 at 14:29  
Subject: Fwd: Fw: your e mail dated .....

To: Yogesh Vargantwar <ybvargantwar@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Rajesh Vargantwar** <vargantwar@gmail.com>  
Date: Tue, 6 Mar 2018, 13:26  
Subject: Re: Fw: your e mail dated .....

To: Ajay Dande <drdande@yahoo.com>

Cc: Sachin Jhavar <sachinjhavar@gmail.com>, Dr. Shoeb Hashmi <drshoebhashmi@gmail.com>, Dr. MANJIRI RAJIV NAIK <drrajivcnaik@gmail.com>

Sir,

We deny all the contents of your email dated 22.02.2018.

Regards

Rajesh Vargantwar

On Thu, Feb 22, 2018 at 11:39 AM, Ajay Dande <drdande@yahoo.com> wrote:

this is in reply to your mail dated.....

Please note the following :

- 1) VHVPL has paid all the rent to you till 31/03/2017.
- 2) You send us the legal notice but then you only introduced Mr.Rajpal as an arbitrator and in our meeting with him you and we mutually agreed in presence of Dr Yogesh Vargantwar, Dr Shoeb Hashmi, Dr Sachin Jhavar and me , that you do not wish to pursue legal course of action. So as a respect to the arbitrator, and as agreed in that meeting, we have not given any reply to the legal notice sent to us by you.
- 3) As we have mutually agreed both the concerned parties do not wish to take the matter to court.

Please do not force us to take this matter to the courtroom.

- 4) In our meeting dated 31/03/2017 we have mutually agreed that rent of Feb, March and January half month 2017 was remaining and will be adjusted against the 40 lacs Rupees deposit you have with you and some other dues like Electricity bill etc... which we paid on your behalf for some reasons.

Please also note that building rent till 31st December 2016 already paid.

- 4) We also have agreed in presence of Dr Yogesh Vargantwar, Dr Shoeb Hashmi , Dr Sachin Jhavar, Dr.Rajiv Naik myself and you that from the date of 01/04/2017 the entire business / collection of neurosurgery department will be kept by Dr Yogesh Vargantwar (except for the Intensivist half pay and deductions as per hospital policy), the deduction of 40 percent which was supposed to be done for hospital will not be done by the hospital and this amount should be considered as rent of the property from 1st April 2017 till we vacant the building, and hospital will provide you all supporting services including manpower, electricity, phone service.

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

*R*

388

Apart from us all Share holders and Directors of company are aware of and agreed for above mentioned settlement of rent.

Both of you, Dr Yogesh Vargantwar and yourself agreed to this on the condition that a separate account should be created and entire collection of neurosurgery should be deposited in that account and Dr Yogesh should be the sole operator of that account. In accordance to this agreement an account was opened in Devgiri Nagari Sahakari Bank. Since then his entire monthly collection has been deposited in that account and he also has withdrawn money. On the contrary the TDS on this total amount has been paid by the hospital which he needs to pay to the hospital.

5) Please note that we have informed you in presence of all the 5 persons mentioned above, in the same meeting that we will be vacating the premises mostly on 31st march 2018 or Maximum for sure by 30 April 2018.

6) It was also decided and communicated to you and Dr Yogesh Wargantwar in presence of our arbitrator Mr. Rajpal at his office N-3 Cidco, Aurangabad, in September 2017 that we will be vacating your premises on 31 march 2018 OR maximum for sure 30 April 2018 for which you already agreed.

SO, YOUR CONTENTION THAT 6 MONTHS NOTICE HAS NOT BEEN GIVEN TO YOU BY US IS TOTALLY FALSE AND IS WITH MALAFIED INTENTION.

7) You and Dr.Yogesh Vargantwar also agreed that time that you will buy back your old equipment's and will pay to VHVPL for fixed furniture and assets of hospital, which we are leaving behind in your building, will pay losses as shareholder before leaving the company as per your share till 31st March 2017.

And agreed to adjust the amount of extra Rent paid by hospital to you till 31st March 2017.

And hospital will try to pay the remaining professional fees of Dr. Yogesh, which we are actually not supposed to pay right now, because the same period professional fees of other working consultants are remaining for all working consultants and shareholders / Directors of the company due to heavy losses in company.

Irrespective of all agreed discussions in past and so many favours to both of you now you are denying for agreed terms, that's why we are not able to move for final settlement.

We, as present Board of Directors, are still ready to do final settlement on agreed terms in past as discussed with the arbitrator ,

From: directors of VHVPL

Dr.Ajay Dande

Dr.Sachin Jhawar

Dr.Shoeb Hashmi

Dr.Rajiv Naik

CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

U

4. From the record we find that the Appellant- Dr. Yogesh Baliram Vargantwar is the partner of a partnership firm who is the Landlord as well as a Professional Doctor working in the Neurosurgery Department of the Respondent- 'M/s. Vighnaharta Health Visionaries Private Limited'- ('Corporate Debtor'). Part-IV of Form-5, which is the application under Section 9, shows that the claim related to 'Professional Fee' as due to the Appellant and not paid is much more than Rupees One Lakh. The amount

receivable from the 'Corporate Debtor' against professional charges for routine patient till November, 2017 has been shown in Annexure enclosed to Form-5, which reads as follows:

**AMOUNT RECEIVABLE FROM CORPORATE DEBTOR  
AGAINST PROFESSIONAL CHARGES OF ROUTINE  
PATIENTS - (TILL 30 NOV 2017)**

SR.NO.	MONTH	AMOUNT RECEIVABLE FROM CORPORATE DEBTOR	AMOUNT RECEIVED IN CASH	AMOUNT RECEIVED BY CHEQUE*
1	Apr-17	1,095,937.00	505,000.00	1,280,000.00
2	May-17	1,234,191.00	490,000.00	1,190,000.00
3	June-17	1,275,256.00	190,000.00	2,600,000.00
4	July-17	1,174,792.00	168,000.00	2,234,000.00
5	Aug-17	1,299,617.00	310,000.00	900,000.00
6	SEPT-17	1,203,116.00	205,000.00	1,590,000.00
7	OCT-17	1,611,643.00	52,000.00	815,000.00
8	NOV-17	2,149,308.00	0.00	1,355,604.00
9	TDS AS PER 26AS PAID BY CORPORATE DEBTOR UPTO 09.02.2018		0.00	1,328,778.00
		<b>₹ 11,043,860.00</b>	<b>1,920,000.00</b>	<b>13,293,382.00</b>
			Total amount received	<b>15,213,382.00</b>

\* These payments included payment towards old dues

*B. Bagantwar*  
*B. Bagantwar*

5. The fee for November, 2017 is more than Rs.21,49,308/-, apart from fee of the other month as shown therein. This is not disputed by the 'Corporate Debtor'.

6. E-mail dated 22<sup>nd</sup> February, 2018, as referred and extracted above, shows that the matter relates to payment of rent, which is not the subject matter of the application under Section 9.

7. In so far as the payment of professional charges is concerned, no dispute about the charges has been raised, but mere stand has been taken that the account has not been opened. There is nothing on the record to suggest that the amount has been paid.

8. In the aforesaid documents and in the account of the 'Corporate Debtor' dues having shown more than Rs. 94 lakhs, it was not open to the Adjudicating Authority to reject the application on the ground that it has not been crystalized. In fact, if the amount is not claimed at this stage and later on 'Corporate Debtor' may take a plea of limitation. This apart, in absence of any evidence relating to professional charges raised by the 'Corporate Debtor' prior to the Demand Notice under Section 8(1) dated 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2018, we hold that it is a fit case for 'Admission'.

9. For the reasons aforesaid, we set aside the impugned order dated 29<sup>th</sup> March, 2019 and remit the case to the Adjudicating Authority to admit the application under Section 9 after notice to the Respondent, so that the Respondent- 'Corporate Debtor' may get an opportunity to settle the matter prior to the admission of the application.

The appeal is allowed with aforesaid observations and directions. No costs.

(Justice S.J. Mukhopadhaya)  
Chairperson

(Justice Venugopal M)  
Member(Judicial)

Ar/g