NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 182 of 2018

IN THE MATTER OF:

Bhavik Bhimjyani

...Appellant

Vs

Uday Vinodchandra Shah, RP of
Neelkanth Township & Construction Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.Respondents

Present:

For Appellant: Mr. Darpan Wadhwa, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Kush

Chaturvedi, Mr. Aman Varma, Ms. Smriti Churiwal and Ms. Chaitrika Patki, Advocates.

For Respondents: Mr. Arun Kathpalia, Sr. Advocate wi

Mr. Abhishek Anand, Advocate for R-1 (RP).

Mr. Sidharth Samantray and Mr. Anuj Sarma,

Advocates for R- 2

ORDER

06.12.2018: The Appellant, a shareholder/ex-director has preferred this appeal against order dated 26th April, 2018 passed by the Adjudicating Authority (National Company Law Tribunal) Mumbai Bench wherein the Adjudicating Authority made following observations and passed following directions:-

"9. On examination of the records of the company, it appears that advances given to these entities aggregating to more than ₹30 crores which is appearing in page No. 66 of this application. By correspondence made by R1, we are prima facie of the view that the promoter/director is hiding information from the Resolution professional as to ensure that the transaction entered into with the related companies; its subsidiaries and third parties are not shown as receivables/debts payable to the Corporate Debtor, in view of the same, R1 is hereby directed to furnish the documents that

this applicant has sought in the e-mail dated 02.04.2018, which is annexed as Exhibit R to this application within 7 days hereof, failing which this Applicant is at liberty to approach this Bench for further directions."

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Resolution Professional in reply affidavit dated 18th September, 2018 brought on record the a Chart to suggest the documents required by the Resolution Professional and the documents already provided by the Appellant, also showing why Resolution Professional requires those items. The chart is extracted below:-

S.no.	Documents required	-	Reason as to why the RP				
	by the RP	the RP	requires them				
	A) Advances made by the Corporate Debtor to Lighthouse Developers Pvt. Ltd. for						
advan	advancing a sum of Rs.5,27,00,000/-						
1	Memorandum of		The Corporate Debtor has				
	Understanding dated	Meeting dated 6th January	advanced a sum of				
	6 th January 2015	2015 reproducing the	Rs.5,27,00,000/- to				
	(" MOU ") executed by	contents of the MOU and	Lighthouse Developers				
	the Corporate Debtor	approving the execution of	from the finances raised				
	and Lighthouse	the said MOU.	from the Financial Creditor				
	Developers.	But, the SIGNED MOU is	but the Corporate Debtor				
		neither annexed to the	has taking no steps				
		said minutes of the	whatsoever to recover the				
		meeting nor handed over	aforesaid amount				
		to the RP.	advanced to Lighthouse				
2	Corporate Debtor's	Bank Statements of the	Developer.				
	Bank Statement	Corporate Debtor	It is pertinent to note that				
	showing the advance	pertaining to the period	Mr. Bhavik Bhimjyani and				
	given to Lighthouse	when the said advances	his family hold				
	Developers Private	were made to Lighthouse	approximately 60% stake				
	Limited	Developers have not been	in Lighthouse Developers				
		handed over to the RP. The	Private Limited and that				
		RP is in possession of the	Mr. Bhavik Bhimjyani was				
		Corporate Debtor's bank	a director in Lighthouse				
		statements from 10th	Developers till October'17.				
		August 2015 onwards.	Further, Lighthouse				
			Developers and the				
			Corporate Debtor share the				
			same registered address.				

3	Balance Confirmation Statement from	The RP by its email dated 21st February 2018 has				
	Lighthouse Developers and	called upon Lighthouse Developers to confirm the				
	Financial Statement	outstanding amount due and payable by it to the				
		Corporate Debtor as well				
		as for certain supporting documents to be provided				
		to the RP for the same. Till				
		date, No Response has been received from				
		Lighthouse Developers Private Limited.				
		Private Limited.				
B) Advances made to Bhagirathi Padte, Levi Bonkar, Mahesh Raukar, Manisha Korde, Prashant Garud and Sunder Padte						
1	Ledger Copies of each	T	The Corporate Debtor			
1	advance made to the	_	has advanced a sum of			
	aforesaid individuals,	said persons pertains to a	Rs.61 lakhs to the said			
	from the date of advance till date.	period much prior to the period for which	persons from the funds raised from the			
2	Personal Details of the	documents were handed	Financial Creditor.			
	aforesaid persons to	over by the Mr. Bhavik Bhimjyani to the RP. No.	However, till date, the Corporate Debtor has			
	whom the said advances have been	Documents/explanation	recovered the said sums			
	made.	has been provided by Mr. Bhavik Bhimjyani for	advanced.			
3	Latest Status of these	making these advances				
4	Advances. Reasons as to why the	except that the said advances made are old and				
	Corporate Debtor	that the same are not				
	never recovered the	recoverable.				
	said advances from the aforesaid persons.					
5	Details of the Land for					
	which these said					
6	advance were made					
6	Board resolutions authorizing the					
	Corporate Debtor to					
	make the said					
	advances.					

	C) Wholly Owned Subsidiaries – Urban Rupi Infrastructure Private Limited and Neelkanth Palm Realty Private Limited				
2	Incorporation Documents of the aforesaid wholly owned subsidiaries. Filings made with the	The Corporate Debtor has raised Rs.51 crores from the Financial Creditor out of which a sum of Rs.30.95 crores has been advanced to these 2 wholly owned	The Wholly owned subsidiaries of the Corporate Debtor hold assets acquired directly through the funds received and raised by		
	ROC during the last 2 financial years.	of approximately 50 acres of land in the same of project admeasuring approximately of 80 acres, in which the remaining 30 acres stands in the name of the Corporate Debtor. Further, the land the wholly owned to the control the control the wholly owned to the control the control the control the control the control the wholly owned to the control the	Creditor. In order, to safeguard the assets of the Corporate Debtor, it is imperative that the RP		
3	Minutes of the Board Meetings held in the last two years and minutes of the Annual General Meeting held				
4	Signed Financial Statement for the last 3 years		subsidiaries of the		
5	Trial Balance as on date	the Financial Creditor itself. The subsidiaries are wholly owned and do not			
6	Original Land Records	have any operations whatsoever except that			
7	Bank Statements for last two years	they have taken a loan from the Corporate Debtor for purchasing the said lands.			
8	Details of Legal Cases, if any	No Documents pertaining to the WHOLLY OWNED subsidiaries have			

3. Reply affidavit has been filed by the Appellant. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the Appellant submits that signed copy of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated 6th January, 2015 executed by Corporate Debtor and 'Lighthouse Developers' is not available with the Appellant. Whatever document were available have already handed over to the Resolution

this Honourable Tribunal

Professional, rest of the documents may be lying with the other Directors. In so far as Item No. 2 and 3 of Clause (A) regarding advance payment made by the Corporate Debtor to 'Lighthouse Developers' and balance confirmation statement from 'Lighthouse Developers' and financial statement as shown in the Chart are concerned, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of Resolution Professional submits that those documents have already been received from the Bank.

- 4. In so far as advances made to Bhagirathi Pate, Levi Bonkar, Mahesh Raukar, Manisha Korde, Prashant Garud and Sunder Padte are concerned learned senior counsel for the Appellant submits that whatever documents were available with him have already been handed over to the Resolution Professional. He further submits that he Appellant will cooperate with the Resolution Professional to trace rest of the documents from the persons who had already received advances.
- 5. In so far as Clause (C) i.e. documents relates to subsidiaries 'Urban Rupi Infrastructure Private Limited' and 'Neelkanth Palm Realty Private Limited', learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the Appellant submitted that the Appellant will provide all the documents. However, he submits that thought the Resolution Professional may take the copies of the records of the flats but cannot take over the subsidiaries in question without any direction of a court of competent jurisdiction or Adjudicating Authority.
- 6. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the Resolution Professional submits that the Corporate Debtor has been ordered for liquidation and now the Resolution Professional is functioning as Liquidator. He intends to protect all the assets of the Corporate Debtor including the records as detailed in the Chart.

-6-

7. In the circumstances, we direct the Appellant to allow the Liquidator to

inspect the records of 'Urban Rupi Infrastructure Private Limited' and 'Neelkanth

Palm Realty Private Limited' to trace out if any of the records of the Corporate

Debtor are available therein or records as mentioned in the Chart extracted

above. If any of the record of the Subsidiary Company related with the Corporate

Debtor as recorded in the chart aforesaid is traced, the Appellant will hand over

the copies of same to the Resolution Professional/ Liquidator.

8. We make it clear that the Resolution Professional/ Liquidator has no

jurisdiction to take over any asset of the subsidiary company of the Corporate

Debtor including 'Urban Rupi Infrastructure Private Limited' and 'Neelkanth

Palm Realty Private Limited', therefore, the Resolution Professional cannot take

the original documents available with the subsidiary companies though he may

take authenticated photocopies of those documents.

8. Part of the impugned order dated 26th April, 2018 wherein observation has

been made against the Appellant is set aside and stands modified to this effect.

The appeal is disposed of with aforesaid observations and directions.

[Justice S. J. Mukhopadhaya]

Chairperson

[Justice Bansi Lal Bhat] Member (Judicial)

am/sk