

THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

M.A. No.105/2018

In

Un-numbered Competition Appeal (AT) No. /2018

(F.No.13/04/2018/NCLAT/UR/269)

In the matter of:

Asmi Metal Products Pvt. Ltd. Applicant/Appellant

Versus

SKF India Ltd. Respondent

Appearance: Shri Dhawal Deshpande, Advocate for the Applicant.

14.05.2018

This is an application to extend the time granted for curing the defects.

2. The allegation in the application is that the delay in curing the defects was caused as the Applicant took time in completing the formalities. The delay is alleged to be neither intentional nor deliberate. Hence, the prayer is to extend the time for compliance by 25 days.

3. The points that arise for consideration are:

(i) Whether the delay in curing the defects is liable to be condoned as prayed for in the application?

(ii) Reliefs.

4. **Point No.(i): -** Heard the learned counsel for the Applicant.

The aforesaid Appeal under Section 53B of the Competition Act, 2002 (hereinafter referred to as the Act of 2002) against the order dated 24.01.2018 of the CCI in Case No. 66 of 2017 is seen presented before the Registry on 13.04.2018. The appeal when scrutinized on 16.04.2018 was found to be defective and hence on the same day the Applicant was informed of the defects with a direction to cure the same within a period of seven days. The period of seven days expired on 23.04.2018. However, the appeal was presented after curing the defects only on 10.05.2018 and hence according to the Section there is a delay of 17 days' in presenting the appeal

after curing the defects and so the matter has been put up before me for appropriate orders.

5. The Finance Act, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as the Act of 2017) brought in certain amendments to the Act of 2002. In addition to the amendments made, some of the sections of the Act were omitted, i.e., sections 53C, 53D, 53E, 53F, 53G, 53H, 53-I, 53J, 53K, 53L, 53M, 53R and clauses (mb), (mc) and (md) of sub-section (2) to section 63 of the Act.

6. Sub-section (1) to section 63 of the Act of 2002 empowers the Central Government to make Rules by way of notification to carry out the provisions of the Act. In exercise of the powers conferred by clauses (ma) and (me) of sub-section (2) of section 63 read with sub-section (2) of section 53B and sub-section (2) of section 53N of the Act of 2002, the Central Government made the Competition Appellate Tribunal (Form and Fee for Filing an Appeal and Fee for Filing Compensation Applications) Rules, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as the Rules of 2009). The aforesaid provisions of the Act have not been omitted or repealed by the amendments brought in by way of the Act of 2017. Hence, the Rules of 2009 still remain in the statute book.

7. Likewise, section 53-O of the Act of 2002, which has also not been omitted or repealed by the Act of 2017, empowers the Appellate Tribunal (which after the amendment is the NCLAT) to regulate its own procedure subject to the provisions of the Act and any Rules made by the Central Government. In exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of section 53-O, the erstwhile Competition Appellate Tribunal made the Competition Appellate Tribunal (Procedure) Regulations, 2011 (hereinafter referred to as the Regulations of 2011), which also continues to be in statute book without any amendments.

8. The NCLAT Rules, 2016 have not been made applicable by any order or notification of the Central Government to the Appeals filed under the Act of 2002. No new Rules or Regulations under the Act of 2002 have been made after the amendments to the said Act were brought in by the Act of 2017. Therefore, the Rules of 2009 and the Regulations of 2011, which have not been amended pursuant to the Act of 2017 coming into force, govern the procedure for filing and processing of appeal(s) and application(s) filed under the Act of 2002.

9. Sub-rules (1) to (5) to Rule 3 of the Rules of 2009 prescribe the form and the procedure for filing an appeal under the Act of 2002. The format of the appeal is contained in the Form appended to the Rules. Further, sub-rule (6) to rule 3 stipulates that the procedure for filing an appeal would be as decided by the Appellate Tribunal.

10. Sub-section (2) to section 53B of the Act of 2002 stipulates that an appeal under sub-section (1) shall be filed within a period of 60 days from the date on which the impugned order is received by the aggrieved party. The certified free copy of the impugned order dated 24.01.2018 is seen issued on 30.01.2018. Therefore, the Office has rightly computed the period of limitation from 31.01.2018 and when so computed, the period of 60 days expires on 31.03.2018. The initial presentation of the appeal on 13.04.2018 and the subsequent presentation after curing the defects on 10.05.2018 are obviously much beyond the period of 60 days provided under the Act of 2002 for filing the appeal.

11. Regulation 7(2) of the Regulations of 2011 does give the Registrar the power to grant time to rectify defects if any, in case the appeal on scrutiny is found to be defective. However, in this case the initial presentation of the appeal itself is beyond the period of limitation and therefore condoning the delay as prayed for would in effect result in extending the time for filing the appeal, which discretion can only be exercised by the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal by invoking the powers under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 53B of the Act of 2002, which says that the Appellate Tribunal can entertain an appeal after the expiry of the period of 60 days if it is satisfied that there was sufficient cause for not filing it within that period. Hence, the matter be placed before the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for appropriate orders. Point answered accordingly.

12. **Point (ii):** - M.A. No.105/2018 disposed of accordingly.

List the matter before the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal on 16.05.2018.

(C.S. Sudha)
Registrar