

ITEM NO.301

COURT NO.12

SECTION XVII

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Civil Appeal No(s).10856/2016

BHUPINDER SINGH

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

UNITECH LTD.

Respondent(s)

WITH

C.A. No. 2511-2526/2017 (XVII)

(WITH IA No.66938/2017-EXTENSION OF TIME and IA No.90673/2017-EXTENSION OF TIME)

S.L.P.(C)...CC No. 5129-5130/2017 (XIV)

C.A. No. 5174-5181/2017 (XVII)

C.A. No. 5674/2017 (XVII)

C.A. No. 10851/2016 (XVII)

SLP(Cr1) No. 5978-5979/2017 (II-C)

C.A. No. 15493/2017 (XVII)

(IA No.77581/2017-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.77582/2017-CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION and IA No.78654/2017-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS and IA No.82788/2017-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS)

C.A. No. 17008-17011/2017 (XVII)

(WITH APPLN.(S) FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS ON IA 94736/2017, FOR APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS ON IA 96100/2017 FOR CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION ON IA 15770/2018)

C.A. No. 9391-9404/2017 (XVII)

(WITH APPLN.(S) FOR impleading party ON IA 98431/2017 FOR INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT ON IA 98431/2017)

C.A. No. 11008/2017 (XVII)

(IA No.80805/2017-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.85513/2017-INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT and IA No.85519/2017-INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT and IA No.85880/2017-INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT and IA No.95992/2017-impleading party and IA No.98113/2017-APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS and IA No.98117/2017-DELETING THE NAME OF RESPONDENT)

C.A. No. 16858/2017 (XVII)

(IA No.97166/2017-PERMISSION TO FILE APPEAL and IA No.112640/2017-

impleading party and IA No.112648/2017-APPLICATION FOR TRANSPOSITION and IA No.128215/2017-impleading party)

SLP(C) No. 30997/2017 (XVII)  
(I.R.)

C.A. No. 20003/2017 (XVII)  
(IA No.119851/2017-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.119859/2017-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.119854/2017-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING and IA No.119862/2017-APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS)

C.A. No. 3727/2018 (XVII)  
(I.R. and IA No.41950/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.41952/2018-APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS)

SLP(C) No. 12667/2018 (XVII)  
(I.R.)

C.A. No. 6837-6838/2018 (XVII)

Diary No(s). 20540/2018 (XVII)  
(IA No.104959/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.104957/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING APPEAL and IA No.104958/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING)

C.A. No. 8524/2018 (XVII)

C.A. No. 10609/2018 (XVII)  
(WITH IA No.141034/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 30270/2018 (XVII)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.164959/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Diary No(s). 40477/2018 (XVII)  
(WITH IA No.168354/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.168355/2018-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.168356/2018-APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS)

Date : 23-01-2019 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE D.Y. CHANDRACHUD  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.R. SHAH

Counsel for the parties:-

Mr. Pawanshree Agrawal, Adv. (A.C.)  
Mr. Varun K. Chopra, Adv.  
Ms. A. Anamika, Adv.

Ms. Priyanjali Singh, AOR

Mr. Rahul Rathore, Adv.  
Mr. Karunesh Kumar Shukla, Adv.

**Petitioner-in-person**

Mr. M.S. Ganesh, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. K. Seshachary, Adv.  
Mr. Anant K. Vatsya, Adv.  
Mr. Ashok Sikka, Adv.  
Mr. Man Singh Narain Rai, Adv.

Mr. Ghanshyam, Adv.  
Mr. Devendra Singh, AOR

Mr. Shubhranshu Padhi, AOR

Mr. Rahul Narayan, AOR  
Mr. Shashwat Goel, Adv.

Mr. Deepak Goel, AOR

Mr. Gaurav Bhatia, AOR

Dr. A.M. Singhvi, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Adv.  
Mr. Abhinav Agrawal, Adv.  
Mr. Abhimanyu Bhandari, Adv.  
Mr. Rajiv Kumar Virmani, Adv.  
Mr. Atul Malhotra, Adv.  
Mr. Anuroop Chakravarti, Adv.  
Ms. Tarannum Cheema, Adv.  
Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR

Ms. Divya Roy, AOR

Mrs. Rachana Joshi Issar, AOR  
Ms. Vandana Mishra, Adv.  
K. Vaijyanthi, Adv.  
Shailabh Pandey, Adv.

Mr. Paban K. Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Anchit Sripat, Adv.  
Mr. Himanshu Shekhar, AOR

Mr. Rahul Shyam Bhandari, AOR  
Ms. Bhavya Vijay Tangri, Adv.

Mr. Ruchit Dogar, Adv.  
Mr. Awanish Kumar, AOR

Mr. Ruchit Duggar, Adv.

Mr. Chandrashekher, A.C.  
Mr. Anshul Rai, Adv.  
Mr. S.K. Pandey, Adv.

Dr. Harish Uppal, Adv.  
Mr. Tileshwar Prasad, Adv.  
Mr. Vasanth Bharani, Adv.  
Mr. Vikas Mehta, AOR

Mr. Ajay Kumar Talesara, AOR

Mr. A.P. Sinha, Adv.

Ms. Aswathi M.k., AOR

Ms. Garima Goel, Adv.  
Ms. Nidhi Mohan Parashar, AOR

Mr. Pahlad Singh Sharma, AOR

Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR  
Mr. B. V. Balaram Das, AOR

Mr. Nikhil Nayyar, AOR  
Ms. Pritha Srikumar Iyer, Adv.  
Mr. N. Sai Vinod, Adv.  
Mr. Dhananjay Baijal, Adv.  
Ms. Smriti Shah, Adv.  
Mr. Divyanshu Rai, Adv.  
Ms. Vasudha Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Mansi Binjrajka, Adv.

Mr. Kaushik Choudhury, AOR  
Mr. Akarsh Garg, Adv.  
Mr. Deepanshu Jain, Adv.  
Mr. Shaantanu Jain, Adv.  
Mr. Aneesh Mittal, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Kaushik, AOR

Mr. Avinash Sharma, AOR  
Ms. Madhav Dadhich, Adv.

Ms. Aswathi M.k., AOR

Mr. Ravindra Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Tara V. Ganju, Adv.  
Mr. Anugrah Niraj Ekka, Adv.  
Ms. Rashi Bansal, AOR

Mr. Sunil Mittal, Adv.

Mr. Kshitij Mittal, Adv.  
Mr. Anshul Mittal, Adv.  
Mr. Sushant Bali, Adv.

Ms. Shobha Gupta, Adv.  
Mr. Sourav Roy, Adv.

Mr. M.R. Shamshad, AOR  
P. Kohli, Adv.

Mr. Gopal Jha, AOR  
Mr. Shryesh Bhardwaj, Adv.  
Mr. G.R. Pandey, Adv.

Mr. Atam Ram N.S. Nadkarni, ASG  
Mr. Rajiv Nanda, Adv.  
Mr. T.A. Khan, Adv.  
Mr. B.V. Balramdas, Adv.

Mr. T.N. Singh, AOR  
Mr. Vikas K. Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Umang Tripathi, Adv.

Mr. Sachin Jain, Adv.  
Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Dwivedi, Adv.

Mr. Vipun Kr. Jai, Adv.  
Mr. Yashvardhan, Adv.  
Mr. Puneet Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Anand Sanjay M. Nuli, Adv.  
Mr. Dharm Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Nanda Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Prawal Mishra, Adv.  
for M/s. Nuli & Nuli

Mr. Prashant Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Dheeresh Kumar Dwivedi, Adv.  
Mr. Navodaya Singh Rajpurohit, Adv.  
Mr. Dhawesh Pahuja, Adv.  
Ms. Charu Ambwani, Adv.

Mr. Shashibhushan Adgaonkar, AOR  
Mr. Lalit Mohan, Adv.

Mr. Vivek Gupta, Adv.  
Mr. Pranav Kaashyap, Adv.

Mr. Ishaan Sanghi, Adv.

Mr. Vivek Narayan Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. M.S. Yadav, Adv.  
Mr. Ashok Tobria, Adv.

Mr. S.Y. Usmani, Adv.  
Mr. Pragyan Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Ashwani Garg, Adv.  
Mr. Vijay Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Tarun Gupta, AOR  
Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Shubhranshu Padhi, Adv.  
Ms. Gursimran Dhillon, Adv.  
Mr. P. K. Prabhu, Adv.

Mr. Shish Pal Laler, Adv.  
Mr. Johri Mal, Adv.  
Mr. Sonit Sinhmar, Adv.

Mr. Venkateshwar Rao Anumolu, Adv.  
Mr. Anurag Jain, Adv.  
Mr. Chandra Mohan Anisetty, Adv.

Mr. Narender Prasad Yadav, Adv.  
Mr. Yadav Narender Singh, Adv.

Mr. R.N. Jenjrani, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Hitesh Kumar Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. S.K. Rajora, Adv.  
Mr. R.K. Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Nishit Agrawal, Adv.

Dr. Sumant Bharadwaj, Adv.  
Mr. Y.R. Mishra, Adv.  
Ms. Mridula Ray Bharadwaj, AOR  
Ms. Rinchen Wangmo, Adv.  
Mr. Vedant Bharadwaj, Adv.  
Amol Chitravanshi, Adv.

Ms. Vandana Surana, Adv.  
Ms. Priya Kashyap, Adv.  
Mr. Rajesh Goayl, AOR

Mr. S. Udaya Kumar Sagar, Adv.  
Mr. Mrityunjai Singh, Adv.

Fiiza Moonis, Adv.

Mr. Ravindra Bana, Adv.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Thomas O., Adv.  
Ms. Aniruddha P. Mayee, AOR

Dr. Aman Hingorani, Adv.  
Ms. Priya Hingorani, Adv.  
Mr. Himanshu Yadav, Adv.  
for Hingorani & Associates

Mr. Rabindra Tiwari, Adv.  
Mr. Arvind Gupta, Adv.  
Mr. Ashish Singh, Adv.

Mr. Sukant Vikram, AOR  
Anshuman Shahni, Adv.  
Mr. Abhinav, Adv.

Mr. Rupesh Kumar, Adv.  
Ms. Praveena Gautam, Adv.  
Ms. Anil Katiyar, Adv.

Ms. Sanya Talwar, Adv.  
Mr. D.K. Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Sanyat Lodha, Adv.  
Ms. Sanjana Saddy, Adv.  
Ms. Anindita Mitra, Adv.

Ms. Gargi Khanna, Adv.

Ms. Shilpa Chohan, Adv.  
Mr. Jitender Chaudhary, Adv.  
Mr. Rajesh Singh, Adv.

Mr. U.A. Rana, Adv.  
Mr. Himanshu Mehta, Adv.  
for M/s. Gagrat & Co.

Mr. Brijendra Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Anoop Kr. Srivastav, Adv.  
Mr. A.K. Sriraj, Adv.

Mr. Abhay Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Himanshu Pal Singh, Adv.

Mr. Anand Grover, Sr. Adv.  
Ms. Geetanjali Shah, Adv.  
Ms. Anjali A., Adv.  
Mr. S. Saroop, Adv.  
Mr. Himanshu Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Anurag Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Jeetender Gupta, Adv.

Ms. Garima Jain, Adv.  
Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AOR

Ms. Pallavi Sengupta, Adv.  
Mr. Siddhant Kohli, Adv.

Mr. Dinesh K. Garg, Adv.  
Mr. Abhishek Garg, Adv.  
Mr. Dhananjay Garg, Adv.  
Mr. Deepak Mishra, Adv.  
Mr. R.K. Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Ashwarya Sinha, AOR  
Ms. Priyanka Sinha, Adv.  
Mr. Alok Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Roshan Santhalia, Adv.  
Mr. Harsh Agrawal, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

I.A. No.117007 in SLP(CrL.) No.5978-5979 of 2017

On 30 October 2017, a Bench of three-Judges of this Court admitted the petitioners to bail, subject to a deposit of a sum of Rs750 crores in the Registry of this Court by the end of December, 2017.

The relevant part of the order of this Court is extracted below:

“Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length it is directed that the petitioners shall be admitted to bail subject to the condition that they shall deposit a sum of Rs.750 crores in the Registry of this Court which shall be kept in an interest earning fixed deposit. The deposit shall be made by the end of December 2017. If the petitioners deposit the amount within the said time, liberty is granted to mention.”

The above order was preceded by an order dated 24 August 2017 requiring the deposit of Rs15 crores within two weeks and an order dated 1 September 2017 requiring a further deposit of Rs5 crores by 6 September 2017. The



order dated 1 September 2017 provides that on the conditions being satisfied, the Court was inclined to admit the petitioners on interim bail on the next date of hearing in order to enable the petitioners to refund the moneys to consumers who had booked flats in various projects.

Thereafter, as stated earlier, on 30 October 2017, an order was passed by this Court admitting the petitioners to bail subject to the deposit of Rs750 crores by 31 December 2017. Admittedly, this order has not been complied with.

Dr. A.M. Singhvi, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, submitted that the custody of the two directors is not in pursuance of any procedure known to the Cr.P.C. He urges that thus far, the petitioners have caused a deposit of an amount of Rs419 crores, in addition to which a further amount of Rs45 crores is ready to be deposited on account of the proposed sale of the land at Sriperumbudur where the buyer is ready with that amount. It has been submitted that the balance of Rs305 crores represents money which will be committed to be paid in pursuance of proposed transactions for the sale of land at Sriperumbudur and Bangalore. Besides this, it has been submitted that an amount of Rs105 crores represents a committed figure arising out a binding Term Sheet Agreement for the transfer of the shares of a Power company together with

land at Nagpur in favour of M/s. Sterling & Wilson, a company in the Shapoorji Pallonji Group. Of this amount, it has been submitted that an amount of Rs68 crores would be paid over after the NOC of the bankers, leaving approximately Rs35 crores in balance.

Dr. Singhvi has submitted that between the date of arrest and the present time, 2839 dwelling units were offered for possession to flat purchasers. On this basis, it has been urged before the Court that the petitioners have, besides the amounts which have been deposited in the Court, made a *bona fide* effort to enter into committed transactions for the monetization of assets.

Mr. Pawanshree Agrawal, learned *amicus curiae*, has submitted before the Court that the condition on which the petitioners were granted bail was the deposit of Rs750 crores. This amount was based on the initial estimate of the refund due to flat purchasers, assessed at Rs2,000 crores in October 2017. The *amicus curiae* submits that in the affidavit which was filed on behalf of the petitioners at the relevant time, in October 2017, it was estimated that the assets of UNITECH would be monetised in six months, resulting in a realization of Rs1,500 crores of which one half would be utilized for the purposes of refund to flat buyers and the other half for completion of construction. We find that there has been an abject failure to meet the commitments which were

made to the Court.

The Court has been apprised of the result of the registration of flat buyers on the web portal maintained by the *amicus curiae*. In pursuance of the order of this Court, the claim for refund has now increased to approximately Rs2,500 crores. This is inclusive of persons who have orders for refund from competent *fora*, in the amount of about Rs630 crores, as on 30 November 2018.

The *amicus curiae* has submitted that a distinction must be made between an offer of allotment and the actual handing over of possession to the flat buyers. Flat buyers may not be ready to accept possession unless the flats are ready in all respects and provided there is an occupation certificate.

Adverting to the amount of Rs464 crores which has been deposited (inclusive of the amount of Rs45 crores for the Sriperumbudur land), it has been submitted by the Amicus Curiae that an amount of Rs40 crores has been deposited by M/s. Pioneer under a joint venture agreement will have to be excluded while an amount of Rs56 crores has been deposited towards moneys due and payable in other civil appeals. If this is taken into account, the amount which has been deposited after the date of arrest is approximately Rs365 crores.

Mr. Rajiv Nanda, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Investigating Officer, has submitted a status

report of the investigation.

The record before the Court indicates that initially a First Information Report was registered in pursuance of an order dated 27 July 2015 passed by the ACMM II, Patiala House Courts under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure on a specific complaint. Subsequently, 173 more complaints were received against the builder in respect of the same residential project. The value of the investment of the complainants is approximately Rs70 crores. The status report indicates that UNITECH has still not complied with various requirements such as the approval of a demarcation-cum-revised layout plan for its residential colony in Sector 70 at Gurgaon, submission of zoning plan, building plan and environment clearance, among other formalities. *Prima facie*, it has been indicated that the investigation establishes that money which has been realised from the flat purchasers has been siphoned off. The EOW has filed a charge-sheet and a supplementary charge-sheet. Hearings on the framing of charges is to take place before the Trial Judge on 7 February 2019.

By the order of this Court dated 30 October 2017, the petitioners were admitted to bail, subject to the deposit of an amount of Rs750 crores. The order in that regard was passed by a three-Judge Bench of this Court. At this stage, the admitted facts before the Court indicate that the order for the deposit of Rs750 crores has not been

complied with. The prayer for enlargement on bail is misconceived because the petitioners have been admitted to bail, subject to the condition of deposit which is not fulfilled. The two directors have been arrested following the orders passed by the ACMM. They failed to obtain any order from the Delhi High Court.

Under the circumstances, we see no reasonable basis on which a two-Judge Bench of this Court should be led to modify the earlier order of a three-Judge Bench, particularly when the order for deposit of money has not been complied with.

By an order dated 7 December 2018, this Court directed a forensic audit of the projects of UNITECH. The forensic audit is being conducted by Grant Thornton India LLP, auditors on the panel of SEBI.

For the above reasons, we see no reason to issue any directions on the application which has been moved on behalf of the petitioners by Dr. A.M. Singhvi. The application is accordingly dismissed.

Since the proceedings for framing of charges are listed for 7 February 2019, the Trial Judge shall take up and complete the stage of framing of charges on an expeditious basis.

SLP(Cr1.) Nos.5778-79 of 2017

The *amicus curiae* has submitted a report before this Court for directions.

The Report contains several items, including the following:

**"DIRECTION OF APPROVAL FOR SALE OF UPTL**

1. Unitech has signed a binding term sheet and agreed on a draft Share Purchase Agreement with Sterling Wilson for the sale of its company UPTL for 105 crores, out of which 68.40 Cr. is promised to be deposited with the Registry of this Hon'ble Court after the fulfilment of conditions laid in the term sheet. The balance 35 crores will be backed by a bank guarantee issued in favour of an escrow agent. An application seeking approval for the said transaction has been filed by Unitech. Necessary directions may be given on the said issue."

Insofar as the above transaction is concerned, we are of the view that before the grant of approval by the Court can be considered, there should be an assessment of the fair market value and other terms proposed by a professional expert. Since Grant Thornton India LLP have been appointed by this Court to conduct a forensic audit, we request them to scrutinize the Term Sheet Agreement and submit a report before this Court preferably within a period of two weeks from today.

Mr. Abhimanyu Bhandari, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners has agreed to furnish all relevant materials, as may be required by the auditors to complete the process.

The second item in the Report is to the following effect:

**"Directions required based on the Minutes of Meeting of the Committee**

2. An MOU has been entered into between Priyadarshini Foundation Pvt. Ltd. and Unitech

Limited as regards the land parcel in Sriperembedur. Pursuant thereto an amount of 45 crores is ready to be deposited by the buyer in this Hon'ble Court. Direction may be issued in that regard."

We permit Priyadarshini Foundation Pvt. Ltd. to deposit an amount of Rs45 crores with the Registry of this Court within two days. The Justice Dhingra Committee is requested to indicate to this Court an estimate of the amounts which are required for the completion of the construction of those projects which are substantially complete. The Committee may, in its report, indicate the projects, the stage and the timelines of construction, together with other details, including the towers and the estimate of expenses required.

Justice Dhingra Committee is requested to complete this exercise preferably within a period of two weeks.

The third item in the Report pertains to refund of amounts due to fixed deposit holders.

By the order of this Court dated 7 December 2018, 10% of the deposited amount has been retained towards payment for the fixed deposit holders. Among the fixed deposit holders, there are those who have decrees in their favour of competent courts or *fora* and others whose claims are yet to be adjudicated.

The *amicus curiae* will be at liberty to receive details from the fixed deposit holders and thereafter

present a report before this Court indicating the amounts which are due and payable to those who have decrees or orders in their favour and otherwise. This exercise shall be completed within two weeks. The *amicus curiae* shall keep the portal in operation for the fixed deposit holders for a further period of two weeks so as to obtain an updated status of fixed deposit holders.

The fourth item in the Report pertains to ex-employees.

Mr. Bhandari, learned counsel appearing on behalf of UNITECH shall take instructions on this aspect so as to facilitate the passing of orders on the next date. Mr. Bhandari shall, within a period of two weeks from today, file an updated chart on affidavit of the ex-employees, the amounts which are due and payable including the amounts towards provident fund dues, gratuity, ESI and other statutory dues. The chart shall also indicate the TDS deducted but not deposited with the income tax authorities. A copy of the aforesaid chart and affidavit shall be furnished to the *amicus curiae* as well as Ms. Tara V. Ganju and Ms. Rashi Bansal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the ex-employees.

The *amicus curiae* shall be at liberty to contact the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner so that the correct position can be ascertained.

Our attention has been drawn to an order dated 6 June 2017 passed by the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner,



Regional Office-Delhi(South) indicating that an amount of Rs.12.33 crores is due and payable for the period between June 2015 and April 2016.

The *amicus curiae* shall inform the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner that the Employees Provident Fund Organization would be at liberty to move an appropriate application in these proceedings for necessary orders.

The fifth item in the Report pertains to directions to NOIDA Authority.

The *amicus curiae* is permitted to serve a copy of his report on Mr. Ravinder Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of NOIDA.

Learned counsel has stated that he will file a response within a period of two weeks from today.

The next item in the Report pertains to payments to assisting counsel.

M/s. UNITECH shall pay an amount of Rs2 lakhs each to Mr. Varun Chopra, learned counsel who is assisting in the hearings in the Committee meetings of Justice Dhingra Committee and Mr. Aneesh Mittal, who is assisting on the technical front by managing the web portal.

An amount of Rs5 crores which is lying in the Registry of this Court and an amount of Rs45 crores, which is to be deposited within two days, shall be invested in a Fixed Deposit of a nationalised bank initially for a period of three months, which shall be renewed from time to time.

List the matters on 7 February 2019 at 2.00 p.m. as part heard along with I.A. Nos.145494, 134987, 134971, 134965, 134982.

(SANJAY KUMAR-I)  
AR-CUM-PS

(SAROJ KUMARI GAUR)  
COURT MASTER