

IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU BENCH

[Through Physical hearing/VC Mode (Hybrid)]

ITEM No.15

**I.A No. 113, 169, 184, 187, 188, 189, 251, 317, 524
574, 908, 951, 953, 955/2025, 78, 74, 404, 408, 410/2026**

**I.A (Liq.) (PR) 12/2026, 78/2026,
IA (Liq) PR 74/2026, 404, 408,410,505 & 515/2026 in
C.P.(IB) No. 78/BB/2024**

IN THE MATTER OF:

Aditya Birla Finance Ltd ... Petitioner

Vs.

M/s Shapos Services Pvt Ltd ... Respondent

Petition under Section 7 of I & B Code, 2016

Order delivered on: 25.06.2026

CORAM:

**SHRI. SUNIL KUMAR AGGARWAL
HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

**SHRI. RADHAKRISHNA SREEPADA
HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

PRESENT:

For the RP : Shri Chithra Nirmala, for Shapos Farms

For the RP : Ms Amritha Jain, for Shapos Services

For R3 in IA.317 & 953 : Shri Anandi Kamani

For R- 3 & 4 in : Shri Mahaligayya

IA 251/2025

The Liquidator : Shri Ravindra Beleyur

For RPF (Applicant) : Ms. B. V. Vidyulatha

in IA Nos. 505/2026 &

515/2026

For Google LLC : Ms. Suyesha Kakarla

For Respondent Nos. 5 & 7

in IA 184/2025 : Ms. Aneeta Mathew

For Erstwhile RP (IA 524 & 574/2025)
and for Liquidator (IA 408 & 410/2026)

: Shri T. Ravichandran

ORDER

1. Heard Ld. Counsels for the parties

2. **I.A 113/2025 & 188/2025**

- i. These applications have been filed by the Resolution Professional under Sections 19(2) and 60(5) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 seeking directions to the Respondents, the suspended Directors of **M/s. Shapos Farms Private Limited** in I.A. No. 113/2025 and **M/s. Shapos Services Private Limited** in I.A. No. 188/2025, to extend complete cooperation in the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process and to hand over the books of accounts, records, assets, documents, login credentials and other information sought by the Resolution Professional through communications dated 23.09.2024 and 18.11.2024.
- ii. It is submitted that despite repeated communications calling upon the Respondents to cooperate and furnish the requisite records relating to the Corporate Debtor, the Respondents have failed to hand over the documents and information necessary for conducting the CIRP.
- iii. In IA 188 of 2025 it is seen from the records that copies of the application along with the annexures were duly served upon the Respondents through Registered Post Acknowledgement Due (RPAD). The RPAD sent to Respondent No. 2 was delivered on 03.01.2025.
- iv. Further in IA 113 of 2025 it is seen from the records that copies of the applications along with the annexures were duly served upon the Respondents through e-mail dated 20.12.2024. Despite due service and sufficient opportunity, the Respondents have neither entered appearance nor filed any reply controverting the averments made in the applications.

- v. Despite sufficient opportunity, no reply has been filed by the Respondents controverting the averments made in the application.
- vi. Having considered the pleadings and the material placed on record, we are satisfied that under the scheme of Code when the Creditors have to be in control of Corporate Debtor on commencement of CIRP, the Respondents being the suspended Directors of the Corporate Debtor, are under a statutory obligation under Section 19 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 to extend all assistance and cooperation to the Resolution Professional. In the absence of any rebuttal and considering the continued non-cooperation alleged by the Applicant, the application deserves to be allowed.
- vii. Accordingly, I.A. No. 113/2025 and 188/2025 are **allowed**. The Respondents are directed to extend complete cooperation to the Resolution Professional and hand over all books of accounts, records, documents, assets, electronic records, login credentials and all other information sought in the communications dated 23.09.2024 and 18.11.2024 within two weeks from the date of this order, failing which the Resolution Professional shall be at liberty to seek appropriate orders in accordance with law.

3. **I.A 169/2025**

- i. This application has been filed by the Resolution Professional under Sections 19(2) and 60(5) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 seeking directions to the Respondents, the Managing Director and Chief Operating Officer of Google India Private Limited, to provide super-administrative access to the email accounts of the Corporate Debtor and furnish the data stored therein.
- ii. It is the case of the Applicant that despite addressing a communication dated 28.12.2024 requesting access to the email accounts of the Corporate Debtor, the Respondents have failed to respond.

- iii. It is seen from the records that copies of the application along with the annexures were duly served upon the Respondents through e-mail dated 03.02.2025. Despite due service and sufficient opportunity, the Respondents have neither entered appearance nor filed any reply controverting the averments made in the application.
 - iv. Having considered the application, we are of the view that the relief sought cannot be granted in the present proceedings. The Respondents are third-party service providers and do not fall within the ambit of Section 19 of the Code, which casts a duty of cooperation upon the personnel, promoters and persons associated with the management of the Corporate Debtor. In the absence of any statutory obligation under Section 19 on the Respondents, no directions as prayed for can be issued in this application.
 - v. Accordingly, **I.A. No. 169/2025 is hereby dismissed.**
4. **I.A 184/2025** is disposed of via **separate order**.
 5. Let RP complete the pleadings in other respective IAs.
 6. List I.As **187/2025, 534/2025 and 908/2025** for **Orders** and **list the case on 16.07.2026.**

-Sd-
RADHAKRISHNA SREEPADA
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

-Sd-
SUNIL KUMAR AGGARWAL
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU BENCH

*(Exercising powers of Adjudicating Authority under
The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016)
(Through Physical Hearing/ VC Mode (Hybrid))*

I.A. No. 184/2025

in

C.P. (IB) No. 78/BB/2024

IN THE MATTER OF:

M/s Shapos Services Private Limited

No.1568/ 1442/7, 30 Feet Cross Road,
Haralur Main Road, Bengaluru -560103, Karnataka
Represented by

Ravindra Beleyur

erstwhile Interim resolution Professional of
M/s Shapos Services Private Limited

... Applicant

VERSUS

Sri. Mayank Tiwari

Director of Shapos Services Private Limited
And Shapos Farms Private Limited
Flat No. 117, Tower 5, Parappana Agrahara
Main Road, Bengaluru-560068

... Respondent No.1

Sri. Saurabh Kumar Agarwal

Director of Shapos Services Private Limited
And Shapos Farms Private Limited
No. 131, Rainbow Residency,
Junnasandra, Bengaluru-560035

... Respondent No.2

Searce Cosourcing Service Private Limited

Regd off:- 31 Arham, Subhash Road,
Moti Tanki, Rajkot - 360 001, Gujarat

... Respondent No.3

Sri. Abhishek Jhagarawat

Authorised Representative
Searce Cosourcing Service Private Limited
IT-06, 6th Floor, Qubix Business park SEZ,
Blue Ridge Approach Road, phase 1,
Hinjewadi Rajiv Gandhi Infotech park,
Pune, Maharashtra- 411057

... Respondent No.4

Amazon Web Services India Private Limited

Block E, 14th Floor, Unit Nos. L4OL to L42L
International Trade Tower, Nehru Place,
New Delhi- 110019.

... Respondent No.5

Ms. Shalini Kapoor

Whole-time Director

#726, Adarsh palm retreat, Outer Ring Road,
Bellandur Post, Behind Intel Campus, Devara
Beesana Hali, Bengaluru- 560103

... Respondent No.6

Sri. Venkatraman Gopalakrishnan Sundar Ram

Whole-time Director

Flat-O01, Tower-2, Vipul Greens, Sohna Road,
Sector-48, Gurgaon- 122018, Haryana

... Respondent No.7

Order delivered on: 25.06.2026

CORAM:

Shri Sunil Kumar Aggarwal, Hon'ble Member (Judicial)

Shri Radhakrishna Sreepada, Hon'ble Member (Technical)

COUNSELS PRESENT:

For Respondent Nos. 5 & 7 in IA 184/2025 : Ms. Aneeta Mathew

ORDER

1. The present application has been filed by the erstwhile Interim Resolution Professional under Section 19(2) read with Section 60(5) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016("IBC"), inter alia seeking directions against the Respondents to extend cooperation and provide access to the data and records of the Corporate Debtor allegedly stored in the AWS cloud account.
2. Brief facts of the case are as under:
 - i. The Corporate Debtor, namely **M/s Shapos Services Private Limited**, was admitted into Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) vide order dated 17.09.2024 passed in C.P. (IB) No. 78/BB/2024. Pursuant thereto, an Interim Resolution Professional was appointed.
 - ii. In accordance with the provisions of the Code, a public announcement was made on 23.09.2024 inviting claims from creditors of the Corporate

Debtor. It is submitted that upon commencement of CIRP, the Interim Resolution Professional addressed communications dated 23.09.2024 to the suspended directors of the Corporate Debtor, inter alia seeking handover of all assets, documents and records pertaining to the Corporate Debtor, including access to electronic data and accounts.

- iii. The Applicant submits that certain documents were shared by one of the suspended directors through electronic means; however, access to critical information, including access to the AWS cloud account and email accounts of the Corporate Debtor, was not provided.
- iv. The Applicant, vide subsequent communications, sought clarifications with regard to certain transactions of the Corporate Debtor and requested access to business and accounting data stored in the AWS cloud account. In response, the suspended directors stated that the AWS account had become inaccessible due to non-payment of dues.
- v. Despite repeated follow-ups, including communications dated 07.10.2024, 16.10.2024 and 18.11.2024, the suspended directors have failed to provide access to the AWS account or furnish the required data and information.
- vi. In view of the lack of cooperation from the suspended directors, communications were also addressed to Respondent No. 3, namely Searce Cosourcing Service Private Limited, stated to be the service provider/vendor facilitating access to AWS services for the Corporate Debtor, seeking details of dues and assistance in accessing the data stored in the AWS cloud.
- vii. The Respondent No. 3 has filed its claim as an operational creditor and annexed the Statement of Work executed with the Corporate Debtor, from which it is inferred that the Corporate Debtor had availed AWS cloud services through Respondent No. 3.
- viii. However, despite several communications addressed to Respondent No. 3 and its authorised representatives, no effective assistance has been

provided in retrieving or accessing the data of CD stored in the AWS cloud account.

- ix. Thereafter communications were addressed to Respondent Nos. 5 to 7, namely Amazon Web Services India Private Limited and its officials, requesting access to the AWS account and the data stored therein. After a series of communications, they informed the Applicant that the AWS account of Corporate Debtor had been closed and the data therein deleted, in accordance with their internal policies.
 - x. The Applicant contends that the non-disclosure of such closure and deletion of data, coupled with the failure to provide access to the records of the Corporate Debtor, has materially hindered the conduct of the CIRP.
 - xi. In the above circumstances, the present application has been filed for appropriate directions to the Respondents to extend cooperation and provide access to the data, records and information of the Corporate Debtor, including the data allegedly stored in the AWS cloud account.
3. It is further submitted that prior to filing the present application, the Applicant caused service of a copy of the proposed Interlocutory Application along with its annexures upon all the Respondents through e-mail dated 29.01.2025. Thereafter, the Applicant, vide covering letter dated 06.02.2025, also effected service of the application upon the Respondents through Speed Post. The Applicant has placed on record copies of the covering letter, postal receipts and India Post tracking reports evidencing service upon the Respondents. The tracking reports indicate that service was duly effected upon Respondent Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7, while in respect of Respondent No. 1 the postal article was returned with the endorsement "Addressee Left without Instructions", and in respect of Respondent No. 4 the postal article remained on hold with the endorsement "Door Locked - Intimation Served". Accordingly, this Adjudicating Authority is satisfied that reasonable steps were taken by the Applicant to effect service upon all the Respondents before institution of the present application.

4. The Respondent Nos. 5 & 7 (AWS) have filed reply/Objections dated 14.05.2025 to petitioner's claim stating:
- i. At the outset, it has been submitted that Respondent No. 6 is no longer a director of Respondent No. 5 and had ceased to hold such position during the pendency of the proceedings therefore, her continued impleadment is unwarranted. It is further submitted that Respondent No. 7 has also ceased to be a director subsequently.
 - ii. It is their case that there exists no privity of contract between Respondent No. 5 and the Corporate Debtor. Respondent No. 5 operates under a structured multi-tier distribution model, wherein it provides cloud services through distributors and resellers. In the present case, the Corporate Debtor had availed AWS services through Respondent No. 3 (Searce), which in turn was engaged through a distributor, namely **Crayon Software Experts India Private Limited**.
 - iii. Under such Distribution Account Model, Respondent No. 5 has no direct contractual relationship with the Corporate Debtor and is not involved in the commercial arrangements between the distributor, reseller and the end customer. Therefore, no obligations can be fastened upon Respondent No. 5 vis-à-vis the Corporate Debtor.
 - iv. Further, Respondent No. 5 is merely a service provider of cloud infrastructure and operates as a "data-blind" entity, having no visibility, control or access over the data stored by customers. The data stored in any AWS account remains under the exclusive control of the account holder and/or the distributor managing such an account. The AWS account of the Corporate Debtor bearing ID No. 405744707053 was not directly controlled by Respondent No. 5 but linked to a management account operated by the distributor, namely Crayon Software Experts India Private Limited.
 - v. The closure of said account was initiated on 25.12.2023 by the distributor through an automated system process and not by Respondent

- No. 5. Such closure is affected through API-based automated mechanisms without any manual intervention on the part of Respondent No. 5.
- vi. As per the applicable AWS Service Terms, data associated with an account is retained only for a limited period of 90 days post closure, after which it is permanently deleted. Accordingly, the data pertaining to the Corporate Debtor stood deleted on or about 24/25.03.2024.
 - vii. The CIRP of the Corporate Debtor commenced only on 17.09.2024, i.e., several months after the deletion of the data. The first communication from the Resolution Professional seeking access to the data was received only in or around November 2024, by which time the data had already been permanently deleted.
 - viii. Respondent No. 5 does not presently possess any data or records relating to the Corporate Debtor and therefore cannot be directed to produce or provide access to the same. Respondent No. 5 has duly cooperated with the Resolution Professional by responding to communications and providing available information regarding the account closure process, including the timeline and internal records evidencing the same.
 - ix. The allegation of non-cooperation is baseless and unfounded, as Respondent No. 5 has disclosed all information available with it and did not withhold any material in its possession.
 - x. Moreover, Section 19 of IBC, 2016 is not applicable to Respondent No. 5, as it is neither personnel of the Corporate Debtor nor a person associated with its management. In support of this contention, reliance is placed on judicial precedents to stress that third-party entities having no nexus with the management of the Corporate Debtor cannot be compelled to furnish information under Section 19.
 - xi. Reliance placed by the Applicant on provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 is misplaced, as the obligation to maintain books of account lies upon the Corporate

Debtor and not upon a third-party service provider. The provisions of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act are not applicable to the facts of the present case.

- xii. The Respondent No. 5 cannot be held liable for the acts of its distributors or resellers, as the relationship is on a principal-to-principal basis and Respondent No. 5 does not exercise control over the actions of such downstream entities.
 - xiii. It has thus been urged that the present application, in so far as it seeks directions against Respondent Nos. 5 to 7, is misconceived and liable to be dismissed.
5. The Applicant has filed a rejoinder to the reply filed by Respondent Nos. 5 and 7, reiterating the averments made in the application and denying the contentions raised by the said Respondents.
- i. At the outset, it is stated that the defence taken by Respondent Nos. 5 and 7 is an attempt to evade responsibility by placing reliance on contractual arrangements and distribution models, which cannot override the statutory obligations cast under the IBC, 2016.
 - ii. It is contended that Respondent No. 5, being the principal service provider of the cloud infrastructure on which the Corporate Debtor's data was hosted, cannot absolve itself of its responsibility merely on the ground that the services were routed through a distributor and reseller.
 - iii. The data stored on the AWS cloud constitutes critical business and financial information of the Corporate Debtor and Respondent No. 5, being the custodian of such infrastructure, was under an obligation to preserve and facilitate access to such data for the purposes of the CIRP.
 - iv. The plea of absence of privity of contract is misconceived, inasmuch as the services availed by the Corporate Debtor were, in substance, AWS services and Respondent No. 5 had operational visibility over the account, including account identifiers and closure logs.

- v. Section 19(2) of the Code casts a statutory obligation on any person having custody or control over the assets or information of the Corporate Debtor to extend cooperation to the Resolution Professional, and such obligation cannot be defeated by contractual structuring.
- vi. Further the deletion of data by Respondent No. 5 is unlawful and contrary to statutory mandates, including the requirement under Section 128 of the Companies Act, 2013 for preservation of books of account, as well as the principles of data retention.
- vii. Respondent No. 5 has failed to disclose, in a timely manner, that the account of the Corporate Debtor had been closed and that the data had been deleted. It is contended that such disclosure was made belatedly, despite repeated communications from the Resolution Professional, thereby causing prejudice to the conduct of the CIRP.
- viii. Reliance placed by Respondent No. 5 on automated processes and distributor actions is untenable, as Respondent No. 5, being the provider of the underlying infrastructure, was duty bound to ensure that critical data relating to the Corporate Debtor was not irretrievably lost.
- ix. The Applicant also controverted that Respondent No. 5 has extended full cooperation as the responses provided were partial, delayed and did not include essential documents such as closure notices, backup records or complete account details.
- x. The responsibility of Respondent No. 5 cannot be diluted by attributing actions to the distributor or reseller, as such entities operate within the framework established by Respondent No. 5 and under its overarching service architecture.
- xi. Also the overriding effect of the IBC requires all persons having access to or control over the information of the Corporate Debtor to act in aid of the Resolution Professional, so as to ensure effective conduct of the CIRP.
- xii. In view of the above, the Applicant submits that Respondent Nos. 5 to 7 are liable to be directed to extend full cooperation and provide access to

all available data, records and information pertaining to the Corporate Debtor.

6. The Applicant has filed written submissions, reiterating that the present application has been necessitated due to persistent and wilful non-cooperation by the Respondents in providing access to critical data and records of the Corporate Debtor.
 - i. Section 19 of the IBC, 2016 casts a mandatory obligation upon all persons having possession or control over the assets, records or data of the Corporate Debtor to extend full cooperation to the Resolution Professional.
 - ii. The Suspended Directors have failed to provide access to the AWS cloud account and did not disclose the status of the said account, thereby obstructing the CIRP.
 - iii. The Respondent Nos. 3 and 4, despite having access to the AWS account under the Statement of Work, failed to assist in retrieval of the data. Respondent Nos. 5 to 7, being the service provider and custodian of the cloud infrastructure, are under an obligation to preserve and provide access to the data stored therein, and cannot avoid such responsibility by relying upon contractual arrangements or distribution models.
 - iv. It is further submitted that the alleged deletion of data is contrary to statutory obligations, including the requirement of preservation of records, and that the failure to disclose such deletion in a timely manner has prejudiced the CIRP. In view of the above, it is prayed that appropriate directions be issued to the Respondents to extend their full cooperation to RP and provide him access to the data and records of the Corporate Debtor.
7. Learned Counsel appearing for AWSIPL has filed written arguments, reiterating the contentions raised in the reply affidavit and opposing the present application.

- i. It is submitted that there exists no privity of contract between Respondent No. 5 and the Corporate Debtor, as the services were availed through a distributor-reseller model, and therefore no obligation can be imposed upon these Respondents. The AWS account of the Corporate Debtor was operated through a management account controlled by the distributor and that Respondent No. 5 had no direct control over the account.
 - ii. The account was closed on 25.12.2023 at the instance of the distributor and that, in accordance with the applicable service terms, all data was permanently deleted after 90 days, i.e., on or about 24/25.03.2024. By the time CIRP commenced in respect of the Corporate Debtor on 17.09.2024 and the request for access was made, the data was no longer in existence.
 - iii. The Respondents No. 5 and 7 do not fall within the ambit of Section 19 of the IBC, 2016, as they are neither personnel of the Corporate Debtor nor persons associated with its management.
 - iv. Learned Counsel further submits that the reliance placed by the Applicant on the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 is misplaced and not applicable to the present case.
8. We have carefully considered the pleadings, documents placed on record and the submissions made by the Learned Counsels for the respective parties.
 9. It is an undisputed position that upon commencement of CIRP, the Resolution Professional sought access to the books of accounts, records and data of the Corporate Debtor, including access to the AWS cloud account. However, from the material available on record, it is evident that Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 failed to provide complete access to the AWS account and did not disclose the actual status of the said account in a timely manner. The explanation that the account had become inaccessible due to non-payment of dues does not absolve them of their statutory obligation. The obligation under Section 19 of the Code is mandatory and requires full disclosure of all information relating

to the affairs of the Corporate Debtor. The conduct of Respondent Nos. 1 and 2, in not providing access to the data or relevant credentials and in failing to disclose the closure and deletion of data, clearly amounts to non-cooperation within the meaning of Section 19 of the Code.

10. It is not in dispute that the Corporate Debtor availed AWS services through Respondent No. 3 and that a Statement of Work existed between them. From the material placed on record, it prima facie appears that Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 had access to the AWS account and were in a position to assist the Resolution Professional in retrieving or facilitating access to the data. However, despite repeated communications, no effective assistance was extended by them. In view of their contractual relationship and role in provisioning the services, Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 are required to extend cooperation to the Resolution Professional to the extent of data, records and information available with them.
11. The principal issue for consideration is whether Respondent Nos. 5 to 7 can be brought within the ambit of Section 19 of the IBC, 2016 and consequently be directed to provide access to the data of the Corporate Debtor. From the material available on record, the following facts emerge:
 - i. There exists no direct contractual relationship between Respondent No. 5 and the Corporate Debtor;
 - ii. The services in question were availed through a distributor–reseller model involving intermediary entities;
 - iii. The AWS account of the Corporate Debtor stood closed on 25.12.2023;
 - iv. In terms of the applicable service conditions, the data associated with the said account was permanently deleted after a period of 90 days, i.e., on or about 24/25.03.2024;
 - v. The CIRP commenced subsequently on 17.09.2024;
 - vi. The request for access to the data was made only thereafter.

12. In the aforesaid factual backdrop, this Adjudicating Authority is of the considered view that Respondent Nos. 5 to 7 cannot be construed as “personnel of the Corporate Debtor” or as persons “associated with the management of the Corporate Debtor” within the meaning of Section 19 of the Code. Further, it is a settled principle that no direction can be issued to a party to produce material which is not in its possession or control. The record clearly indicates that the data sought by the Resolution Professional is no longer available with Respondent Nos. 5 to 7, having been deleted prior to the commencement of CIRP.
13. This Adjudicating Authority also finds that the reliance placed by the Applicant on the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 is misplaced in the facts of the present case, as the obligations under the said enactments cannot be extended to fasten liability upon a third-party service provider in the absence of a direct legal or contractual nexus. In view of the above, this Adjudicating Authority is of the considered opinion that no case is made out for issuance of directions against Respondent Nos. 5 to 7 under Section 19 of the Code.
14. In view of the foregoing discussion and findings, this Adjudicating Authority is of the considered opinion that the present application deserves to be partly allowed. Accordingly, the following directions are issued:
 - i. Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 (Suspended Directors) are hereby directed to extend full cooperation to the Resolution Professional in terms of Section 19 of the IBC, 2016 and to forthwith provide all information, documents, records, credentials and access available with them pertaining to the affairs of the Corporate Debtor.
 - ii. Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 (Searce Cosourcing Service Private Limited and its authorised representative) are directed to extend necessary cooperation to the Resolution Professional and to provide all data, records and information, if any, available with them or accessible to them in relation

to the Corporate Debtor, including any details pertaining to the AWS account.

- iii. Insofar as Respondent Nos. 5 to 7 (Amazon Web Services India Private Limited and its officials) are concerned, this Adjudicating Authority is of the considered view that no case is made out for issuance of directions under Section 19 of the Code. Accordingly, the reliefs sought against Respondent Nos. 5 to 7 **stand rejected**.
 - iv. The Resolution Professional is at liberty to take appropriate steps in accordance with law in the event of continued non-cooperation by Respondent Nos. 1 to 4.
15. The present **I.A. No. 184/2025 stands partly allowed** in the above terms.

-Sd-

(RADHAKRISHNA SREEPADA)
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

-Sd-

(SUNIL KUMAR AGGARWAL)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)