

**NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL,**

**PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

**Company Appeal (AT) (Ins) No. 233 of 2021**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**DwarkadhishSakharKarkhana Ltd.**

**Appellant**

**Vs.**

**Pankaj Joshi &Anr.**

**...Respondents**

**Present:**

**For Appellant: Mr. Shikhil Suri, Mr. Shiv Kumar Suri, Ms. Shilpa Saini, Mr. Ankit Paleja, Mr. Shadab Jan and Ms. MadhuSuri,Advocates.**

**For Respondent: Mr. Utsav Mukherjee, Mr. TanseemZariwala and Ms. MeghaTyagi, Advocates for R-1  
Mr. SumeshDhawan, Ms. VatsalaKak, Ms.Geetika Sharma, Advocates for R-2.**

**O R D E R**  
**(Virtual Mode)**

**28.05.2021:** Ld. Counsel for the Appellant submits that the Appellant's resolution plan has erroneously not approved by the Adjudicating Authority and now the CoC is considering other two resolution plans, therefore, there is urgency in the matter. The matter is a part heard so it be heard at an early date.

Ld. Counsels for the Respondents have no objection in early hearing of the matter. They submit that the matter is part heard, therefore, it may be listed before the same bench.

Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No. 1 submits that against the same impugned order, Respondent No. 1 has filed Appeal CA (AT) (Ins) No. 333 of 2021, therefore, it may be listed alongwith this Appeal.

We have considered the submissions, the matter be listed before the same bench alongwith CA (AT) (Ins) No. 333 of 2021.

In CA (AT) (Ins) No. 333 of 2021, Respondents are directed to file Reply Affidavit within a week.

Let these matters be fixed as part heard before the same bench for hearing on **09<sup>th</sup> June, 2021**.

**[Justice Jarat Kumar Jain]**  
**Member (Judicial)**

**[Dr. Ashok Kumar Mishra]**  
**Member (Technical)**

SC/md.