

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

**I.A. No.970 – 971 of 2020 in**  
**Company Appeal (AT) (Ins) No.796 of 2019**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**Directorate of Revenue Intelligence**

**...Appellant**

**Versus**

**Shree Ganesh Jewellery House Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.**

**...Respondents**

**For Appellant:                    Shri Ajit Sharma, Advocate**

**For Respondents:                Shri Sachin Dutta, Sr. Advocate with Shri Ruchir  
Mishra and Shri Ramneek Mishra, Interveners  
Shri Gaurav H Sethi and Shri Abhinav Tyagi,  
Advocates (R-1 & 2)  
Shri Anup Singh, Liquidator**

**ORDER**  
**(Virtual Mode)**

**28.01.2021**                On record, there does not appear proof of service of Notice on Respondents 3 to 6 after initial Order of issue of Notice was passed on 6<sup>th</sup> August, 2019. The Appellant needs to pay the process fee which does not appear to have been paid. The Appellant to make efforts and complete service on Respondents 4 to 6 also as they have been arrayed as Respondents.

In the meanwhile, the Counsel for Appellant and Respondents 1 and 2 to file written submissions and copies of the Judgements as were directed on 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2021, within two weeks.

The learned Counsel for Intervener who has filed I.A. No.970 – 971 of 2020 refers to para – 6 of the Application to submit that he had withdrawn the Appeal with liberty to file Intervention Application. Copy of the said Order is not on record. The Intervener may file copy of the same.

Counsel for Intervener submits that the Intervener is custodian of the property concerned under the SEZ Act. This is disputed by the learned Counsel for the Appellant claiming that the property has been seized by the Appellant.

It would be appropriate that the Appellant files response to I.A. 970 – 970 of 2020 within two weeks.

List the Appeal ‘for admission (after Notice) hearing’ on 26<sup>th</sup> February, 2021.

[Justice A.I.S. Cheema]  
Member (Judicial)

[V.P. Singh]  
Member (Technical)

*rs/md*