

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Comp. App. (AT) (Ins) No. 782 of 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

Aidem Ventures Pvt. Ltd.

...Appellant(s)

Versus

Skyline Radio Network Ltd.

...Respondent(s)

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. Kunal Tandon, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Deepak Joshi, Mr. Rudra Pratap & Ms. Natasha Singh, Advocates.

For Respondents : Mr. P. Nagesh, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Shaurya Aditya, Mr. Deepak Shukla, Mr. Alok Singh, Ms. Radhika Choubey & Ms. Geetu Bishnoi, Advocates.

With

Comp. App. (AT) (Ins) No. 783 of 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

Aidem Ventures Pvt. Ltd.

...Appellant(s)

Versus

E24 Glamour Ltd.

...Respondent(s)

Present:

For Appellant : Mr. Kunal Tandon, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Deepak Joshi, Mr. Rudra Pratap & Ms. Natasha Singh, Advocates.

For Respondents : Mr. P. Nagesh, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Shaurya Aditya, Mr. Deepak Shukla, Mr. Alok Singh, Ms. Radhika Choubey & Ms. Geetu Bishnoi, Advocates.

With

Comp. App. (AT) (Ins) No. 784 of 2026

IN THE MATTER OF:

Aidem Ventures Pvt. Ltd.

...Appellant(s)

Versus**News 24 Broadcast India Ltd.****...Respondent(s)****Present:**

- For Appellant** : Mr. Kunal Tandon, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Deepak Joshi, Mr. Rudra Pratap & Ms. Natasha Singh, Advocates.
- For Respondents** : Mr. P. Nagesh, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Shaurya Aditya, Mr. Deepak Shukla, Mr. Alok Singh, Ms. Radhika Choubey & Ms. Geetu Bishnoi, Advocates.

ORDER
(Hybrid Mode)

[Per: Justice Mohd. Faiz Alam Khan, Member (Judicial)]

25.05.2026: The aforesaid three appeals have been filed by the appellant- M/s Aidem Ventures Pvt. Ltd. (OC) against the same impugned judgment dated 13.02.2026 passed by National Company Law Tribunal Principal Bench, New Delhi (Adjudicating Authority) in TP (Co. Act.-38(PB)/2023 Old CP No. 451/2013, TP (Co. act.)-39(PB)/203 Old CP No. 429/2013, TP (Co. Act.)-40 (PB)/2023 Old CP No. 450/2013 moved under Section 9 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (Code) whereby all the petitions filed by the appellants have been rejected by the Ld. Adjudicating Authority by passing a common judgment.

2. All aforesaid appeals have been filed against the same impugned order and for the sake of convenience are being disposed of by passing this common judgment.

3. Brief facts necessary for the disposal of these appeals are that appellant has entered into an agreement with three companies namely B.A.G. Infotainment Pvt. Ltd. now known as M/s Skyline Radio Network Ltd., B.A.G. Newline Network Ltd. now known as M/s News24 Broadcast

India Ltd. and B.A.G. Glamour Pvt. Ltd. now known as M/s E24 Glamour Ltd. on 22.04.2010 whereby he was appointed to act as the Exclusive Representative for selling available advertising options for the TV Channel namely News24 and was to receive commission as consideration. He was also responsible for negotiating on behalf of the CD and was entitled to a commission of 12%, 15% and 25% on reaching a particular threshold and the commission was payable within 7 days of collections made by him and paid to the CD.

4. It is contended that the appellant had obtained and submitted various amount to the CD and in turn the CD was liable to pay an amount of Rs. 43,71,768/-, Rs. 8,69,345/- and Rs. 23,08,627/- to the appellant and when this amount was not paid, despite efforts made by the appellant, he filed a petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi under Section 433, 434 and 439 of the Companies Act, 1956 bearing CP No. 451 of 2013 for winding up of the CD.

5. It is further contended that in the meantime, the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 came into force and as per Section 4 of the Code matters relating to Part-II of the Code, relating to the Insolvency Resolution and Liquidation of Corporate Persons were to be processed when minimum amount of default was Rs. 1,00,000/- which was subsequently increased to Rs. 1 Crore on March 24,2020 and the NCLT was designated as the Adjudicating Authority to deal with these matters and a notification was accordingly issued by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs for the transfer of the pending proceedings of winding up to the NCLT and accordingly on 19.10.2023 the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi transferred the matter to NCLT, CA (AT) (Ins) Nos. 782, 783, 784 of 2026

on which an order dated 18.12.2023 was passed by the Ld. Adjudicating Authority for filing of requisite form by the appellant in terms of the provisions of Insolvency and Bankruptcy (Application to Adjudicating Authority) Rules, 2016 which was accordingly done and after considering the objections/reply filed by the Respondent the Ld. Adjudicating Authority by passing the impugned order dismissed the aforesaid three petitions filed by the appellant on the ground that a pre-existing dispute was existing between the parties.

6. Ld. Sr. Counsel for the Respondent has taken a preliminary objection in terms that the petitions filed by the appellant before the Ld. Adjudicating Authority were not meeting the threshold as provided under Section 4 of the Code as applicable on that date and this being a legal issue be decided before proceeding to hear the appeals on merits as the same is touching the maintainability of the petitions filed by the appellant before the Ld. Adjudicating Authority. He has relied on the judgment passed by this Appellate Tribunal dated **25.02.2026 in CA (AT) (Ins) No. 109 of 2026, Mr. Navin Ashokkumar Aswani vs. Falcon Industries and Anr.** He further submits that since it is a legal issue the same must be decided as first and the judgment of Ld. Adjudicating Authority may also be upheld by this Appellate Tribunal apart from the grounds on which it has been passed by the Ld. Adjudicating Authority.

7. Ld. Counsel for the Appellant on the other hand submits that no doubt a Co-ordinate Bench of this Appellate Tribunal in the aforesaid case i.e. Mr. Navin Ashokkumar Aswani (supra) (hereinafter called as Falcons case) has held that after transfer of the petition to the Ld. Adjudicating CA (AT) (Ins) Nos. 782, 783, 784 of 2026

Authority the same must fulfil the threshold as per the amended Section 4 of the Code applicable on that day, but in the said judgment this Appellate Tribunal has not considered the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Jaipur Metals and Electricals (Employees Organisation) vs. Jaipur Metals and Electricals, (2019) 4 SCC 227, BCCI vs. Kochi Cricket Pvt. Ltd. (2018) 6 SCC 287, CIT vs. Dhadi Sahoo, 1994 Supp (1) SCC 257 and A. Navinchandra Steels (Pvt) Ltd. vs. Srei Equipment Finance Ltd., (2021) 4 SCC 435 and the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, (Second Amendment) Act, 2018, Act No.26 of 2018.***

8. While drawing the attention of this Appellate Tribunal towards the amended Section 434 of the Companies Act, 2013, which has been amended vide the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, (Second Amendment) Act, 2018, of date 17.08.2018, it is submitted that by placing a proviso in Section 434 of the Companies Act, 2013 it has been clarified that in an application filed by any party to any proceedings relating to the winding up of companies pending before any court, that Court may by order transfer such proceedings to the Tribunal and the proceedings so transferred shall be dealt with by the Tribunal as an application for initiation of CIRP under the Code and a Repeal and saving clause has also been inserted in this amending Act which has also clarified that notwithstanding such repeal (Repeal of the Amendment Ordinance 2018) anything done or any action taken thereunder shall be deemed to have been done or taken under the corresponding provision of the Code as amended by the Amending Act.

9. Elaborating further it is submitted that the emphasis in the aforesaid provision is on the transfer of the proceedings and therefore the threshold

which was applicable at the time of filing of the winding petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi would be applicable in this case and the threshold which was applicable on the date of transfer could not be applicable.

10. It is further submitted that filing of a petition is a right vested in a petitioner and the same cannot be taken away by amending the Act retrospectively and it could only be taken away if there is any contrary intention appearing in the Amending Act which is absent in the instant case and therefore the threshold as was applicable on the institution of winding of petition before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court is relevant in these petitions.

11. It is further submitted that in Falcons case (supra) the Section 6 of the General Clauses Act has also not been considered and therefore the petition filed by the appellant before the Ld. Adjudicating Authority were maintainable.

12. Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing for the Respondent however relies on Falcon Industries (supra) and submits that whatever submissions are being advanced by Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing for the Appellant has been considered in the Falcons case and that order was assailed by the Falcons Industries before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India by filing Civil Appeal No. 4151 of 2026 and the Appeal has been dismissed on 27.04.2026 and only the question of law has been kept open, however, no interference has been made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the order passed by this Appellate Tribunal.

13. We have heard Ld. Counsel for the parties.

14. It appears to be an admitted fact that in the year 2013 on account of alleged non-payment of Commission to the tune of Rs. 43,71,768/-, Rs. 8,69,345/- and Rs. 23,08,627/- a petition under Section 433, 434 and 439 of the Companies Act, 1956 was filed by the appellant before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. However, in the meantime the Code was enacted and notifications were issued for transfer of certain winding up matters pending before any court to the NCLT which may be treated as application under the Code.

15. It is further reflected that the Hon'ble Delhi High Court has transferred the proceedings pending before it pertaining to the winding up of the CD to the NCLT vide order dated 19.10.2023 by passing the following order:

“Mr. Yashas RK, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner appears through VC.

Mr. Kartikay Dutta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent appears through VC.

Ld. Counsels for both Parties submitted that the present petition has been transferred to this Tribunal by Hon'ble High Court in terms of the provisions of Section 435 of the Companies Act, 2013.

Ld. Counsel appearing for the Applicant undertakes to file the requisite Form in terms of the provisions of Insolvency and Bankruptcy (Application to Adjudicating Authority) Rules, 2016.

Ld. Counsel for the parties shall also ensure the filing of their power before the next date of hearing. They shall also place on record the hard copies of the pleadings.

Lis the matter on 06.02.2024”.

16. It is further reflected that thereafter the appellant filed Form 5 in terms of the Code and relevant regulations and after hearing the parties the petitions filed by the appellant under Section 9 of the Code were dismissed by the Ld. Adjudicating Authority on the ground of pre-existing dispute.

17. We at the outset is in agreement with the submissions made by Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing for the Respondent that if the impugned judgment can be sustained on any other ground then mentioned in the impugned order the same is legally permissible.

18. Section 434 of the Companies Act, 2013 is relevant for our consideration and the same is reproduced as under:

Section 434. Transfer of certain pending proceedings

434. Transfer of certain pending proceedings. --(1) *On such date as may be notified by the Central Government in this behalf, --*

(a) all matters, proceedings or cases pending before the Board of Company Law Administration (herein in this section referred to as the Company Law Board) constituted under sub-section (1) of section 10-E of the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956), immediately before such date shall stand transferred to the Tribunal and the Tribunal shall dispose of such matters, proceedings or cases in accordance with the provisions of this Act;

(b) any person aggrieved by any decision or order of the Company Law Board made before such date may file an appeal to the High Court within sixty days from the date of communication of the decision or order of the Company Law Board to him on any question of law arising out of such order:

Provided that the High Court may if it is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing an appeal within the said period, allow it to be filed within a further period not exceeding sixty days; and

(c) all proceedings under the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956), including proceedings relating to arbitration, compromise, arrangements and reconstruction and winding up of companies, pending immediately before such date before any District Court or High Court, shall stand transferred to the Tribunal and the Tribunal may proceed to deal with such proceedings from the stage before their transfer:

Provided that only such proceedings relating to the winding up of companies shall be transferred to the

Tribunal that are at a stage as may be prescribed by the Central Government.

Provided further that any party or parties to any proceedings relating to the winding up of companies pending before any court immediately before the commencement of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (Amendment) Ordinance, 2018 (Ord. 6 of 2018), may file an application for transfer of such proceedings and the Court may by order transfer such proceedings to the Tribunal and the proceedings so transferred shall be dealt with by the Tribunal as an application for initiation of corporate insolvency resolution process under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 (31 of 2016):

Provided further that only such proceedings relating to cases other than winding-up, for which orders for allowing or otherwise of the proceedings are not reserved by the High Courts shall be transferred to the Tribunal

Provided also that--

(i) all proceedings under the Companies Act, 1956 other than the cases relating to winding up of companies that are reserved for orders for allowing or otherwise such proceedings; or

(ii) the proceedings relating to winding up of companies which have not been transferred from the High Courts;

shall be dealt with in accordance with provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 and the Companies (Court) Rules, 1959.

Provided also that proceedings relating to cases of voluntary winding up of a company where notice of the resolution by advertisement has been given under sub-section (1) of section 485 of the Companies Act, 1956 but the company has not been dissolved before the 1st April, 2017 shall continue to be dealt with in accordance with provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 and the Companies (Court) Rules, 1959.]

(2) The Central Government may make rules consistent with the provisions of this Act to ensure timely transfer of all matters, proceedings or cases pending before the Company Law Board or the courts, to the Tribunal under this section”.

19. The proviso which has been appended to this Section through Amending Act No. 26 of 2018 would conspicuously suggest that if the proceedings of winding up of companies are pending before any court is being transferred to the Tribunal, the said proceedings shall be dealt by the Tribunal as an application for initiation of CIR process under the Code and therefore we do not find any substance so far as the submissions of Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing for the appellant is concerned to the effect that this proviso talks about the transferring of proceedings to the NCLT.

20. If we accept on the submissions made by Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing for the Appellant and if for the sake of arguments, it is believed that the proceedings pending before any court were required to be transferred before the NCLT, in that case there is no need of passing any fresh admission order pertaining to the petition filed under Section 7 or 9 of the Code.

21. The proviso appended with Section 434 of the Companies Act, 2013 is crystal clear that by transfer of such proceedings the same shall be dealt with by the Tribunal as an application of initiation of CIR process under the Code and when the Tribunal would treat such proceeding as an application for initiation of CIRP, the threshold which is applicable on the date of considering of such application would be relevant.

22. Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing for the appellant has emphasised on the Section 6 of the General Clauses Act, However Section 6 of the General Clauses Act Precisely Section 6 (2) provides that notwithstanding any repeal, anything done or action taken under the repealed ordinance shall be deemed to have been done under the Amending Act.

23. Section 6 of the General Clauses Act is generally applicable to the repealing of the Acts or Regulations but if a different intention appears in the repealing Act then this Section would not come to the rescue of the Appellant. As we have already discussed that the proviso appended to Section 434 of the Companies Act, 2013 only talks about that the proceedings of winding up pending before any court to be transformed as an application before the NCLT for initiation of CIRP under the Code and having regard to the simple and plain language used in the proviso appended with Section 434 of the Companies Act, 2013 only one interpretation is possible, that the transfer of proceedings to the NCLT would be dealt with by the NCLT as an application for initiation of CIRP under the Code.

24. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Appellate Tribunal in **Falcon Industries (supra)** in the identical factual situation has framed the following issues for consideration and answered the same in the following manner:

I. Whether on transfer of the Winding Up Petition, which was already admitted by the High Court of Gujarat, the Adjudicating Authority while hearing the Section 9 application has to proceed from the stage i.e. from the stage of admission or has to pass an order of admission on Section 7 application?

II. Whether the Operational Creditor who has converted Winding Up Petition in Section 9 application by filing Form-5 has to satisfy necessary conditions for admission of Section 9 application?

III. Whether threshold for TP No.02(Ahm)2022 transferred by the High Court to the NCLT shall be Rs.1 Lakh or the Operational Creditor had to fulfil the threshold of Rs.1 Crore as applicable w.e.f. 04.03.2020?

IV. Whether the application filed by the Operational Creditor, the threshold of Rs.1 Crore was met on adding interest @ 24% per annum claimed by the Appellant?

V. Whether there was pre-existing dispute between the parties so as to reject the application filed by the Operational Creditor?

19. As noted above, after transfer of the Winding Up Petition, the Operational Creditor filed application in Form 5 to comply the procedural requirement and petition was converted in Section 9 petition which is recorded in the order of the Adjudicating Authority, as noted above, by order dated 06.04.2022. The Adjudicating Authority directed the Operational Creditor to satisfy the Bench with respect to maintainability considering the threshold.

20. Thus, the Operational Creditor has to fulfil the threshold as per amended Section 4 of the I&B Code, 2016, which is specifically noticed in order dated 06.04.2022. We thus are of the view that the mere fact that Winding Up petition was admitted by the Gujarat High Court vide its order dated 11.12.2006 could not be read to mean that Section 9 application in which it was converted after transfer has to automatically admitted.

21. Proceedings under Section 433 and 434 of the Companies Act are Winding Up proceedings and as per the statutory scheme of the Companies Act r/w Companies Court Rules, 1959, the transfer of said Winding Up petition has been made to the NCLT and has to be heard and decided as per the I&B Code.

22. When the Winding Up petition has been transferred to the NCLT, it has to be considered as per the scheme of the I&B Code to fulfil the requirement for admission under Section 9 application which has to be fulfilled and admission of Winding Up petition under Section 433 and 434 of the Companies Act, 1956 shall not obviate consideration of Section 9 application for its admission. In the above context, we may also refer to the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **“(2021) 4 SCC 435, A. Navinchandra Steels (P) Ltd. vs. Srei Equipment Finance Ltd.”**, where Hon'ble Supreme Court had occasion to consider the provision of Section 7, 9 and 238 of the I&B Code in reference to Winding Up Petition under the Companies Act, 2013. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above case in Para 25 and 29 laid down following:

“25. A conspectus of the aforesaid authorities would show that a petition either under Section 7 or Section 9 IBC is an independent proceeding which is unaffected

by winding-up proceedings that may be filed qua the same company. Given the object sought to be achieved by the IBC, it is clear that only where a company in winding up is near corporate death that no transfer of the winding-up proceeding would then take place to NCLT to be tried as a proceeding under the IBC. Short of an irresistible conclusion that corporate death is inevitable, every effort should be made to resuscitate the corporate debtor in the larger public interest, which includes not only the workmen of the corporate debtor, but also its creditors and the goods it produces in the larger interest of the economy of the country. It is, thus, not possible to accede to the argument on behalf of the appellant that given Section 446 of the Companies Act, 1956/Section 279 of the Companies Act, 2013, once a winding-up petition is admitted, the winding-up petition should trump any subsequent attempt at revival of the company through a Section 7 or Section 9 petition filed under the IBC. While it is true that Sections 391 to 393 of the Companies Act, 1956 may, in a given factual circumstance, be availed of to pull the company out of the red, Section 230(1) of the Companies Act, 2013 is instructive and provides as follows:

“230. Power to compromise or make arrangements with creditors and members. — (1)
Where a compromise or arrangement is proposed—

- (a) between a company and its creditors or any class of them; or*
- (b) between a company and its members or any class of them,*

the Tribunal may, on the application of the company or of any creditor or member of the company, or in the case of a company which is being wound up, of the liquidator, appointed under this Act or under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, as the case may be, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, or of the members or class of members, as the case may be, to be called, held and conducted in such manner as the Tribunal directs.

Explanation. —For the purposes of this subsection, arrangement includes a reorganisation of the company's share capital by the consolidation of

shares of different classes or by the division of shares into shares of different classes, or by both of those methods.”

What is clear by this Section is that a compromise or arrangement can also be entered into in an IBC proceeding if liquidation is ordered. However, what is of importance is that under the Companies Act, it is only winding up that can be ordered, whereas under the IBC, the primary emphasis is on revival of the corporate debtor through infusion of a new management.

29. *Dr Singhvi and Shri Ranjit Kumar have vehemently argued that SREI has suppressed the winding-up proceeding in its application under Section 7 IBC before NCLT and has resorted to Section 7 only as a subterfuge to avoid moving a transfer application before the High Court in the pending winding-up proceeding. These arguments do not avail the appellant for the simple reason that Section 7 is an independent proceeding, as has been held in a catena of judgments of this Court, which has to be tried on its own merits. Any “suppression” of the winding-up proceeding would, therefore, not be of any effect in deciding a Section 7 petition on the basis of the provisions contained in the IBC. Equally, it cannot be said that any subterfuge has been availed of for the same reason that Section 7 is an independent proceeding that stands by itself. As has been correctly pointed out by Shri Sinha, a discretionary jurisdiction under the fifth proviso to Section 434(1)(c) of the Companies Act, 2013 cannot prevail over the undoubted jurisdiction of NCLT under the IBC once the parameters of Section 7 and other provisions of the IBC have been met. For all these reasons, therefore, the appeal is dismissed and the interim order that has been passed by this Court on 18-12- 2020 shall stand immediately vacated.”*

23. Hon’ble Supreme Court in the above case has held that proceedings under Section 7 and 9 are independent proceedings which are unaffected by Winding Up Petition.

24. In view of the above discussion our answer to Question No. I and II is as follows:

- I. After transfer of the Winding Up Petition by the High Court to the NCLT after admission of the Winding Up Petition, NCLT has not to mechanically admit the petition and has to examine the application in accordance with provisions of the I&B Code and to*

pass a judicial order after considering as to whether the application need to be admitted under Section 9 or not.

II. After transfer of the Winding Up Petition which has been converted into the Section 9 application, the Operational Creditor has to satisfy all parameters for admission of Section 9 application including threshold.

34. We answer Question No. III and IV in following manner:

III. Threshold for Section 9 application, which was converted in 2022, shall be Rs.1 Crore and the Operational Creditor has to fulfil the threshold of Rs.1 Crore for maintaining Section 9 application.

IV. There being no agreement between the parties regarding payment of interest @ 24% per annum nor there being any other material to prove that Corporate Debtor paid the interest or accepted interest of 24%, the claim of interest cannot be included in the debt and debt being only Rs.7,62,500/- did not fulfil the threshold.

25. The aforesaid judgment of the Co-ordinate Bench would reflect that proceedings of the winding up petitions of the company were transferred to the NCLT and an argument was made by the appellant that the threshold as was provided under Section 4 of the Code or Section 434 of the Companies Act, 2013 at the time of filing of winding up petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi would be applicable but this Appellate Tribunal has repelled this submission.

26. We notice that the aforesaid judgment of this Appellate Tribunal was assailed by the Falcon Industries before the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing the Civil Appeal No. 4151 of 2026 and the appeal was dismissed vide order dated 27.04.2026 by passing the following order:

*“1.We are not inclined to interfere with the impugned judgment and order passed by the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi in CA (AT) (I) No. 109 of 2026; hence the Civil Appeal is dismissed.
2.However, question of law, if any, is kept open.
3.Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of”.*

27. Thus the Hon’ble Supreme Court did not find any good ground to interfere in the aforesaid judgment of the Co-ordinate Bench of this Appellate Tribunal. Therefore, the view taken by this Appellate Tribunal was affirmed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court and only this has been stated that question of law if any is kept open, which in our understanding may not be of much significance as in our considered opinion also we do not find any good ground to take a different view which has been taken by the coordinate Bench in Falcon’s case.

28. In view of the above facts and circumstances and the reasons given, we do not find any illegality in the impugned judgment as the petitions filed by the appellant before the Ld. Adjudicating Authority were not meeting the threshold at the time of transfer of petition to NCLT, as provided under Section 4 of the Code i.e. Rs. 1 Crore and therefore the petitions were not maintainable.

29. Resultantly, the above appeals lacks merits and are **dismissed** as such.

30. There is no order as to costs.

31. Pending IA’s if any are closed.

[Justice Mohammad Faiz Alam Khan]
Member (Judicial)

[Naresh Salecha]
Member (Technical)

sr