IN THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL
DIVISION BENCH, COURT – 1, AHMEDABAD

ITEM No.303
IA/1309(AHM)2026
in
CP(IB) 143 of 2017

Under Regulation 44 (2) of the IBBI Reg. 2016 and Rule 11 of NCLT Rules, 2016

IN THE MATTER OF:

Ravi Kapoor Liquidator of
Accord Industries Limited **.....Applicant**

Order delivered on: 07/10/2026

C O R A M:

MR. SHAMMI KHAN, HON'BLE MEMBER (J)
MR. SANJEEV SHARMA, HON'BLE MEMBER (T)

O R D E R
(Hybrid Mode)

The case is fixed for pronouncement of order. The order is pronounced in the open court, vide separate sheet.

-SD-

SANJEEV SHARMA
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

-SD-

SHAMMI KHAN
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING AUTHORITY
NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL
DIVISION BENCH, COURT– I, AHMEDABAD

IA No. 1309 (AHM) 2026
In
CP (IB) No. 143 of 2017

(Application under Regulation 44 (2) Of the IBBI Liquidation Process Regulations, 2016 And Rule 11 Of the NCLT Rules, 2016)

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN:

RAVI KAPOOR
Liquidator of Accord Industries Limited
402, Shaival Plaza, Gujarat College Road,
Ellisbridge, Ahmedabad

...Applicant

Order Pronounced On: 07.10.2026

C O R A M :

SH. SHAMMI KHAN, HON'BLE MEMBER (JUDICIAL)
SH.SANJEEV SHARMA, HON'BLE MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

A P P E A R A N C E :

For the Applicant : Mr. Harshil Patel, Adv.

O R D E R
(*Per*: Bench)

1. This I.A. No. 1309 of 2026 in C.P. (IB) No. 143 of 2017 has been filed on 07.08.2026 vide inward diary No. E-2285 by the Applicant, Ravi Kapoor, Liquidator of Accord Industries Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Applicant/Liquidator"), under Regulation 44(2) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy

Board of India (Liquidation Process) Regulations, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as the "Liquidation Regulations") read with Rule 11 of the National Company Law Tribunal Rules, 2016, seeking continuation of the liquidation process and the following reliefs: -

> *A. Your Lordships be pleased allow the present Application.*
> *B. Your Lordships be pleased to extend the period of liquidation of the Corporate Debtor for a further period of 6 (six) months for completing liquidation process of the Corporate Debtor from 07.08.2026 or from the date of passing of the order of the present application;*
>
> *C. Your Lordships be pleased to grant such other and further order as may be deemed fit for completion of liquidation process of the Corporate Debtor;*

2. The Corporate Debtor was ordered to be liquidated vide order dated 19.06.2020 passed in I.A. No. 210 of 2020, whereby the Applicant was appointed as the Liquidator under Section 34(1) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 ("Code"). Pursuant to the liquidation order, the Liquidator made the public announcement on 26.06.2020 and filed the list of stakeholders on 08.08.2020.

3. It is stated that in the first meeting of the Stakeholders' Consultation Committee ("SCC") held on 14.08.2020, it was noted that the secured assets of the Corporate Debtor had already been disposed of under the SARFAESI proceedings and no tangible assets remained with the Corporate Debtor. Thereafter, a forensic auditor was appointed and the forensic audit report was considered in the second meeting of the SCC held on 16.06.2021, pursuant to which the Liquidator was requested to initiate appropriate proceedings.

4. The liquidation period was extended from time to time by this Adjudicating Authority and, pursuant to the last extension, the period of liquidation expired on 06.08.2026. The present Application has been filed seeking further continuation of the liquidation process principally for pursuing the pending recovery proceedings and for taking consequential steps for completion of the liquidation process.

5. The Applicant submits that the principal reason for continuation of the liquidation proceedings was the pendency of I.A. No. 543 of 2021, filed under Section 66 of the Code in respect of fraudulent transactions. The said application was partly allowed vide order dated 20.07.2026, whereby the

depletion/disposal of stock valued at ₹30.48 Crores was held to constitute fraudulent/wrongful trading and the erstwhile directors/promoters were directed to jointly and severally contribute ₹30.48 Crores along with interest @ 12% per annum to the liquidation estate.

6. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the Liquidator issued demand notices to the concerned erstwhile directors/promoters. The Applicant submits that in the event of non-compliance, execution and recovery proceedings are required to be initiated under Section 424(3) of the Companies Act, 2013 read with Rules 56 and 57 of the NCLT Rules, 2016, for realization of the amount directed to be contributed to the liquidation estate.

7. It is further submitted that various proceedings are pending before the NCLT, CBI Special Court and PMLA Special Court, which, according to the Applicant, require continuation of the liquidation process. In the 17th Meeting of the Committee of Creditors held on 03.08.2026, the members took note of the order dated 20.07.2026, the proposed recovery/execution proceedings and the pending proceedings and unanimously consented to seeking a further extension of six months. The

aforesaid decision concerning continuation of the liquidation process was distinct from the subsequent composite proposal concerning assignment of recovery rights, the manner of pursuing the recovery proceedings and dissolution of the Corporate Debtor.

8. Pursuant to the directions of this Adjudicating Authority dated 12.08.2026, the Liquidator convened the 18th Meeting of the Committee of Creditors on 27.08.2026, inter alia, to consider the proposal concerning dissolution of the Corporate Debtor and the manner of pursuing the pending recovery proceedings. The representatives of Indian Overseas Bank and Canbank Factors Limited broadly expressed their views regarding the proposed mechanism, subject to approval of their respective competent authorities. Such preliminary views, being expressly subject to approval of the respective competent authorities, cannot be treated as the final decision of the Committee.

9. Thereafter, resolutions were placed before the Committee for e-voting concerning, inter alia, assignment of the rights and obligations arising out of the order dated 20.07.2026 passed in I.A. No. 543 of 2021 in favour of Indian Overseas Bank and

Canbank Factors Limited; authorisation to pursue recovery/execution proceedings; distribution of recoveries in accordance with Section 53 of the Code; dissolution of the Corporate Debtor upon such assignment; and authorisation of counsel for the dissolution proceedings.

10. The Applicant thereafter placed on record the final e-voting results on 25.09.2026 vide inward diary No. D-8276 in compliance with the order dated 02.09.2026. The e-voting for Agenda Item No. 6 was conducted from 31.08.2026 at 01:30 P.M. to 02.09.2026 at 05:00 P.M. The resolution contemplated, inter alia, dissolution of the Corporate Debtor, assignment of the recovery rights arising from the order dated 20.07.2026 in I.A. No. 543 of 2021 and distribution of the recovery proceeds under Section 53 of the Code. The voting position was as follows: -

Member	**Voting Share**	**Vote**
Indian Overseas Bank	75.66%	Against
Canbank Factors Limited	24.34%	Abstained

The aforesaid voting shares constitute the entire voting share represented before this Adjudicating Authority for the said e-voting.

11. Consequently, the aforesaid composite resolution was not approved. Indian Overseas Bank, holding 75.66% voting share, voted against the resolution, while Canbank Factors Limited, holding 24.34% voting share, abstained. The resolution, therefore, received no vote in favour. The failure of the aforesaid composite resolution, however, establishes only that the particular mechanism placed before the Committee was not approved. It does not, by itself, establish that the adjudicated recovery of Rs. 30.48 Crore with interest was abandoned, waived or extinguished, nor does it establish that every other lawful mechanism for preservation and realisation of the said recovery was considered and rejected.

12. We have heard the learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant/Liquidator and perused the Application, the documents placed on record and the material available before us.

13. The principal issue arising for consideration is whether, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, a limited continuation of the liquidation proceedings can be permitted for the purpose of preserving and facilitating enforcement and realisation of the adjudicated recovery arising from the order

dated 20.07.2026 passed in I.A. No. 543 of 2021, particularly when the composite proposal concerning recovery, assignment and dissolution was not approved by the Committee.

14. A further question arises as to the extent to which the jurisdiction of this Adjudicating Authority under Section 60(5) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 ("Code"), read with Rule 11 of the National Company Law Tribunal Rules, 2016, can be exercised in the present circumstances, without overriding the express statutory and regulatory framework or substituting the decision of the Committee with that of this Adjudicating Authority.

15. Regulation 44 of the Liquidation Regulations governs completion of liquidation. Under the regulatory framework applicable prior to the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Liquidation Process) (Fourth Amendment) Regulations, 2026, Regulation 44(1) contemplated completion of liquidation within one year from the liquidation commencement date, notwithstanding pendency of avoidance proceedings. Regulation 44(2) further contemplated an application before the Adjudicating Authority where the

Liquidator was unable to complete the liquidation within the prescribed period, accompanied by a report explaining the reasons for non-completion and the additional time required.

16. Thus, under Regulation 44 as applicable to the liquidation commenced in 2020, continuation beyond the prescribed period was contemplated upon an appropriate application before the Adjudicating Authority. Whether such continuation ought to be granted must, however, depend upon the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements and the facts and circumstances of the particular case.

17. The Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Liquidation Process) (Fourth Amendment) Regulations, 2026, notified on 02.06.2026, amended Regulation 44(1) by providing for completion of liquidation within 180 days and made corresponding changes concerning continuation of the liquidation process.

18. However, the amended Regulation 44 contains an express transitional provision in respect of liquidation processes commenced prior to commencement of the Fourth Amendment Regulations, whereby the requirements of

Regulation 44 as existing before such commencement are to apply to such liquidation processes.

19. The present liquidation commenced on 19.06.2020, prior to commencement of the Fourth Amendment Regulations, 2026. Accordingly, the applicability of the amended 180-day period under Regulation 44 must be determined in accordance with the express transitional provision contained in the said Regulations. The applicability of other amendments introduced into the Code or the Regulations in 2026 has to be considered independently with reference to their respective commencement and transitional provisions.

20. The record shows that successive extensions were thereafter granted by this Adjudicating Authority. The Application records, inter alia, orders dated 05.08.2024, 21.02.2025, 08.08.2025 and 18.02.2026, pursuant to which the liquidation was permitted to continue. The last extension brought the liquidation period up to 06.08.2026.

21. The Corporate Debtor has consequently remained under liquidation for a period of more than six years. The prolonged duration of the liquidation is a relevant consideration and warrants strict scrutiny before granting any further

continuation. At the same time, the length of the liquidation period, by itself, cannot be treated as determinative where a material recovery belonging to the liquidation estate has been judicially adjudicated only immediately before expiry of the existing liquidation period.

22. Repeated extensions cannot be granted mechanically, and the Liquidator must demonstrate that the continuation sought is necessary for completing substantive liquidation work. The present Application, however, is not founded merely upon routine administrative delay. The principal basis relied upon is an adjudicated recovery which arose shortly before expiry of the then-existing liquidation period and which remains unrealised.

23. The Hon'ble NCLAT, in ***Chavva Naga Sampathi Tayaru v. Madasa Kumar***, Company Appeal (AT) (CH) (Ins) Nos. 261 & 260 of 2026, decided on 20.05.2026, considered a case involving a further extension under Regulation 44. The Adjudicating Authority had granted a limited further extension and the Appellate Tribunal declined to interfere. The decision, however, turned upon the facts before the

Appellate Tribunal, including the decision of the SCC and the limited extension granted by the Adjudicating Authority.

24. The aforesaid decision indicates that the fact that an earlier extension has been granted does not, by itself, render a subsequent limited extension impermissible. The question must be determined with reference to the necessity for continuation, the purpose for which the continuation is sought and whether the period granted is appropriately limited.

25. The order dated 20.07.2026 passed in I.A. No. 543 of 2021 assumes central importance in the present case. By the said order, the erstwhile directors/promoters were directed to contribute Rs. 30.48 Crore together with interest at the rate of 12% per annum. The said amount represents a judicially adjudicated right of recovery in favour of the liquidation estate. The Liquidator thereafter issued demand notices and consequential enforcement/recovery steps remain to be undertaken. The order dated 20.07.2026 was passed only 17 days before expiry of the liquidation period on 06.08.2026. The present case is therefore distinguishable from one where

an old or dormant asset remained unrealised throughout the liquidation process.

26. The subsequent amendments introduced in 2026 also recognise, subject to their respective commencement and transitional provisions, the need to provide for the manner in which pending avoidance, fraudulent or wrongful trading proceedings and the proceeds arising therefrom are to be pursued and dealt with. The relevance of those provisions in the present case is therefore to be considered as part of the statutory framework governing the treatment of the pending recovery, and not as creating a retrospective or independent right to extend the liquidation process.

27. In the present case, the Committee was placed before a composite proposal concerning, inter alia, the manner of pursuing the recovery arising from the order dated 20.07.2026, authorisation of the concerned Financial Creditors to undertake recovery, distribution of the recovery proceeds in accordance with Section 53 of the Code and dissolution of the Corporate Debtor. The said composite proposal was not approved. The Tribunal cannot, merely because the proposal failed, presume that the Committee has

approved any alternative mechanism. At the same time, the failure of the particular proposal does not by itself extinguish the adjudicated recovery arising from the order dated 20.07.2026.

28. The subsequent legislative development also supports the necessity of preserving such proceedings. The 2026 amendment substantially **amended Section 54** of the Code.

Under **Section 54(1A)**, where proceedings concerning an avoidance transaction or fraudulent or wrongful trading are pending before an application is made or a decision is made to dissolve the Corporate Debtor, the Committee is required to determine the manner of pursuing such proceedings and the distribution of the proceeds arising therefrom. Section **54(1B)** similarly provides for arrangements concerning pending suits or legal proceedings relating to proceeds distributable under Section 53.

29. The statutory framework concerning pending avoidance and fraudulent or wrongful trading proceedings recognises that the economic benefit arising from such proceedings may continue to require pursuit and appropriate treatment even

where dissolution of the Corporate Debtor is contemplated. The manner of pursuing such proceedings and dealing with the proceeds, however, remains subject to the applicable provisions of the Code, the Regulations and the decision-making mechanism prescribed therein. The statutory framework must therefore be construed so as to preserve both the role assigned to the Committee and the efficacy of an adjudicated recovery forming part of the liquidation estate.

30. Regulation 44A, as amended in 2026, similarly recognises the continued pursuit of pending avoidance and fraudulent/wrongful trading proceedings after dissolution/closure and requires the manner of pursuing such proceedings and distribution of proceeds to be provided for with the approval of the Committee.

31. Therefore, the amended statutory framework itself recognises the economic value of pending proceedings and provides a mechanism through which such value can continue to be realised notwithstanding dissolution. The legislative intent is consequently not to sacrifice an existing recovery merely for the sake of formally bringing liquidation to an end.

32. In the present case, the Liquidator placed before the Committee a proposal concerning, inter alia:

i. The manner of pursuing the recovery arising out of the order dated 20.07.2026;
ii. Authorisation of the concerned Financial Creditors to undertake recovery;
iii. Distribution of the recovery proceeds in accordance with Section 53; and
iv. Dissolution of the Corporate Debtor.

The voting record establishes that the particular composite proposal placed before the Committee was not approved. Indian Overseas Bank, holding 75.66% voting share, voted against the proposal, while Canbank Factors Limited, holding 24.34% voting share, abstained. The resolution consequently received no vote in favour.

33. We are conscious that the Committee has a statutory role in determining, wherever prescribed under the applicable framework, the manner in which pending proceedings are to be pursued and the manner in which the proceeds arising therefrom are to be dealt with. The inherent jurisdiction of this Adjudicating Authority cannot be exercised for the

purpose of substituting the Tribunal's commercial decision for the decision entrusted by Parliament to the Committee.

34. At the same time, the existence of such statutory role cannot mean that an order already passed by this Adjudicating Authority determining a recovery of approximately Rs. 30.48 Crore becomes incapable of effective implementation merely because the earlier liquidation period expires before an appropriate mechanism for pursuing the recovery is put in place. The statutory provisions must, so far as possible, be construed harmoniously so that the role assigned to the Committee is preserved while the adjudicated recovery is not rendered incapable of implementation.

35. **Section 60(5)(c)** of the Code confers jurisdiction upon this Adjudicating Authority in relation to questions of law or fact arising out of or in relation to the insolvency resolution or liquidation proceedings of the Corporate Debtor. The pending recovery arising from I.A. No. 543 of 2021 is directly connected with the liquidation estate and the distribution of the proceeds contemplated under the Code.

36. Further, **Rule 11** of the National Company Law Tribunal Rules, 2016 preserves the inherent power of this Tribunal to

pass such orders as may be necessary for meeting the ends of justice or preventing abuse of the process of the Tribunal. Such inherent power, however, is supplementary to and not in derogation of the express statutory framework and cannot be exercised to circumvent or override an applicable statutory procedure.

37. In ***V.S. Palanivel v. P. Sriram, CS, Liquidator***, 2024 INSC 659, the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the exercise of jurisdiction by the Adjudicating Authority, including the use of inherent powers in an appropriate liquidation context, and recognised that procedural relief may be granted where sufficient cause and exceptional circumstances are established. The said decision arose in the context of extension of time for payment of balance sale consideration and must, therefore, be applied having regard to its factual and statutory context. It does not, by itself, constitute direct authority for an unrestricted continuation of liquidation in the present case.

38. In ***GLAS Trust Company LLC v. Byju Raveendran & Ors.*****,** 2024 INSC 811**,** the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that inherent powers cannot be exercised in contravention of, or in

conflict with, express provisions of law. Where the statute provides an exhaustive mechanism, Rule 11 cannot be invoked to bypass or subvert that mechanism. The said principle is directly relevant to the limited exercise of jurisdiction contemplated in the present case.

39. Similarly, the principles stated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State Bank of India & Ors. v. Consortium of Mr. Murari Lal Jalan and Mr. Florian Fritsch & Anr***., 2024 INSC 852, require that the exercise of jurisdiction under Section 60(5), Rule 11 or other inherent powers remain anchored to the statutory scheme and the objectives of the Code. Such jurisdiction cannot be employed to confer a substantive entitlement which the Code or the Regulations do not otherwise provide.

40. In the present case, this Tribunal does not propose to invoke Rule 11 for the purpose of overriding Regulation 44, dispensing with the statutory role of the Committee or approving a mechanism which was not approved by the Committee. The limited exercise of jurisdiction contemplated herein is confined to preserving the subject matter of the

adjudicated recovery and facilitating the consideration and implementation of the appropriate statutory mechanism.

41. The Tribunal is not creating any new substantive right in favour of the Liquidator or any Financial Creditor. The right to recover the amount arises from the order dated 20.07.2026. Nor is the Tribunal directing that any particular Financial Creditor shall prosecute the pending proceedings. The purpose of the limited continuation is only to preserve the enforceability of the adjudicated recovery and to enable the statutory mechanism for its further pursuit to be considered and, where lawfully approved, implemented.

42. The limited continuation contemplated herein is therefore not an unrestricted extension of the liquidation process and shall not be understood as an exercise of jurisdiction contrary to the statutory framework. It is confined to the peculiar circumstances arising from the recent adjudication of the recovery, the short period available thereafter before expiry of the earlier liquidation period and the absence of an operative mechanism for realisation of the adjudicated amount.

43. If the present Application is rejected outright and the liquidation is treated as concluded immediately, the following position would emerge:

i. The Corporate Debtor has a judicially determined recovery of approximately Rs. 30.48 Crore plus interest;
ii. The recovery remains unrealised;
iii. Consequential enforcement steps remain pending;
iv. The proposed mechanism for pursuing and distributing the recovery has not been approved; and
v. No presently operative mechanism has been demonstrated before us by which the recovery can be efficiently realised and distributed.

44. The order dated 20.07.2026 crystallising the contribution of Rs. 30.48 Crore with interest was passed only 17 days before expiry of the liquidation period on 06.08.2026. The Liquidator, therefore, had only a limited period within which to initiate consequential steps for enforcement of the said order. The Tribunal must also take into account that the composite proposal subsequently placed before the Committee for pursuing the recovery and for dissolution was not approved.

45. In these circumstances, immediate termination of the liquidation process without preserving any effective avenue for dealing with the adjudicated recovery may result in the recovery remaining practically unrealised, although the liability has already been judicially determined. Such a consequence would not advance the objectives of orderly liquidation, value maximisation and distribution of realised proceeds. At the same time, the prolonged duration of the liquidation requires that any continuation granted by this Tribunal must be strictly limited and purpose-specific.

46. The fact that the liquidation has already continued for more than six years, in the circumstance that no tangible assets were dealt in the liquidation proceedings, weighs against granting another routine six-month extension. However, the peculiar circumstance that the material recovery was judicially adjudicated only 17 days before expiry of the existing liquidation period justifies a limited protective continuation for the purposes specified herein.

47. The continuation, if granted, must therefore be limited, purpose-specific, subject to monitoring, directed towards consequential recovery/completion steps and must not

operate as an open-ended continuation of the liquidation process.

48. The Applicant has sought a further period of six months. Having regard to the prolonged duration of the liquidation and the requirement of exercising restraint in permitting further continuation, we are not inclined to grant the entire six-month period. At the same time, immediate rejection of the Application would not be appropriate in view of the adjudicated recovery of Rs. 30.48 Crore with interest and the fact that the said recovery was crystallised only 17 days before expiry of the earlier liquidation period.

49. Having regard to the aforesaid circumstances, a limited protective period of 30 days is considered appropriate. The said period is intended only to enable consequential steps arising from the order dated 20.07.2026, consideration by the Committee of the appropriate manner of pursuing the pending recovery proceedings and consequential arrangements, if any, in accordance with law. The said period shall not constitute a fresh blanket extension of the liquidation process for six months or an unrestricted continuation thereof.

50. It is further clarified that the limited continuation granted herein shall not be understood as conferring upon any Financial Creditor an independent or unilateral right to take over or prosecute the pending Section 66/recovery proceedings.

51. The Hon'ble NCLAT in Bharat S. Patel v. JM Financial Asset Reconstruction Company Ltd., Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 1877 of 2025, decided on 01.12.2025, recognised substitution of a Financial Creditor in place of the Liquidator for pursuing a Section 66 application in circumstances where the SCC had permitted the Financial Creditor to pursue the proceeding and the other Financial Creditor had also consented. The decision therefore recognises the possibility of substitution where the applicable statutory and stakeholder mechanism permits it.

52. The aforesaid decision does not, however, confer an unrestricted unilateral right upon a Financial Creditor to take over or prosecute a pending Section 66 proceeding without following the applicable statutory and regulatory mechanism. Any such assignment, substitution or transfer must therefore

be considered in accordance with the provisions applicable to the present liquidation.

53. Similarly, the decision in ***Harish Chander Arora v. National Company Law Tribunal,*** Company Appeal (AT) (Ins.) No. 307 of 2024, decided on 14.11.2024, may be considered for the limited proposition that the statutory and regulatory framework can provide mechanisms for dealing with economic interests arising from pending proceedings. The said authority does not dispense with compliance with the applicable statutory mechanism or confer an independent right upon a Financial Creditor to assume conduct of pending proceedings.

54. In view of the aforesaid statutory framework, the judicially adjudicated recovery arising from the order dated 20.07.2026, the limited period of 17 days between such adjudication and expiry of the earlier liquidation period, and the failure of the subsequent composite proposal before the Committee, the present case warrants a narrowly confined continuation rather than an unrestricted extension of the liquidation process.

55. The limited continuation is not being granted on the ground that the liquidation has merely remained pending for a long period. It is being granted because a material recovery belonging to the liquidation estate was judicially determined immediately before expiry of the liquidation period and remains unrealised, while the statutory mechanism for dealing with such recovery has not yet resulted in an operative arrangement.

56. The present order, therefore, does not approve any particular assignment, substitution or transfer of the economic benefit of the pending proceedings and does not override the statutory role of the Committee. The purpose of the limited continuation is only to preserve the subject matter of the adjudicated recovery and facilitate lawful consequential steps during the period specified herein.

57. Accordingly, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, we consider it appropriate to permit a limited protective continuation of the liquidation proceedings for a period of **30 days** from the date of this order, subject to the directions contained herein, rather than grant the six-month extension sought by the Applicant.

58. Such continuation shall be confined to the recovery arising from the order dated 20.07.2026 and the consequential statutory steps connected therewith. It shall not be construed as an unrestricted continuation of liquidation or as dispensing with the role of the Committee.

59. The CoC and the Liquidator shall keep in mind the amendments to section 54 and Regulation 44 of the IBBI (Liquidation Process) Regulations, 2016 and shall find a suitable mechanism so that recoveries or any other proceedings are properly taken care of by the financial creditors/ CoC and the liquidation process comes to an end to avoid unnecessary liquidation costs, continuance of proceedings for no useful purpose, and pendency of case before this Adjudicating Authority.

60. In view of the foregoing discussion, I.A. No. 1309 of 2026 filed by the Liquidator, Mr. Ravi Kapoor, is disposed of with the following directions:-

i. The liquidation proceedings of **M/s. Accord Industries Limited** are permitted to continue for a limited period of **30 days** from the date of **this order**, solely for the purposes specified herein and subject to the directions contained in this order.

ii. During the aforesaid limited period, the Liquidator shall take such consequential steps as are permissible in law for preservation, enforcement and realisation of the adjudicated recovery arising from the order dated 20.07.2026 in I.A. No. 543 of 2021, subject to the applicable statutory framework and the directions of this Adjudicating Authority.

iii. The Committee shall, within **15 days** from the date of this order, consider, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Code and the Regulations, the manner in which the pending recovery/Section 66 proceedings are to be pursued and the manner in which the proceeds, if any, are to be dealt with.

iv. The Liquidator shall place before the Committee the complete status of the pending recovery proceedings, including the order dated 20.07.2026, the demand notices issued, the steps already taken and the further steps proposed to be taken.

v. Nothing contained in this order shall be construed as authorising any Financial Creditor to unilaterally take over, prosecute or seek substitution in the pending Section 66/recovery proceedings merely by virtue of its status as a Financial Creditor.

vi. Any assignment, substitution or transfer of the economic benefit of the pending proceedings shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Code and the Liquidation

Regulations and pursuant to the requisite decision or approval of the Committee, wherever so prescribed.

vii. The Liquidator shall continue to discharge his statutory responsibilities during the aforesaid **limited period**, subject to the specific limitations contained in this order.

61. The Liquidator shall file two status reports before this Adjudicating Authority during the aforesaid period of 30 days, as under: -

i. **First Status Report:** The Liquidator shall file the first status report upon expiry of the first fortnight from the date of this order, setting out in detail the steps taken during the said period towards enforcement and realisation of the amount directed to be contributed pursuant to the order dated 20.07.2026, including the notices issued, execution/recovery proceedings undertaken, correspondence made and any other measures taken for securing recovery of the said amount.

ii. **Second Status Report:** The Liquidator shall file the second status report upon expiry of the second fortnight, i.e., at the end of the aforesaid 30-day period, setting out the further steps taken during the second fortnight, the amount, if any, recovered pursuant to the order dated 20.07.2026, the status of the pending proceedings and the decision taken by the

Committee regarding the manner of pursuing the pending proceedings and dealing with the proceeds, if any.

Both the aforesaid status reports shall specifically set out the concrete and effective steps undertaken by the Liquidator towards recovery/realisation of the adjudicated amount, together with the present status and outcome of such steps.

62. The present order shall not be construed as expressing any opinion on the merits of the pending recovery/Section 66 proceedings or on the liability of any person therein. All rights and contentions of the parties in the pending proceedings are kept open.

63. The present limited continuation is granted in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and shall not be construed as laying down any general principle for indefinite continuation of liquidation merely on account of pendency of proceedings.

64. With the aforesaid directions, **I.A. No. 1309 of 2026** in C.P. (IB) No. 143 of 2017 stands **disposed of**. No order as to costs.

-SD-
SANJEEV SHARMA
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

-SD-
SHAMMI KHAN
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

SS