

FOUNDER EDITOR

**U.K. BHARGAVA**

EDITOR

**RAKESH BHARGAVA**

HONY. CONSULTING EDITOR

**R.N. BANSAL**

SEBI & Corporate Laws comes in Six Volumes, Annual subscription for the year 2022 is ₹ 13,700. Single copy ₹ 300 only.

**Back years' volume ₹ 2350 per volume for paper back and add ₹ 250 per volume for Hard case binding.**

SEBI & Corporate Laws Weekly is published on every Monday. **Non-receipt of part must be notified within 60 days of the due date.**

Address your editorial and subscription correspondence to: **Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd., 59/32, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi-110 005. Phone : 91-11-45562222.**

**Printed and Published by Ansh Bhargava on behalf of Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd. and Printed at Tan Prints (India) Pvt. Ltd., 44 Km. Mile Stone, National Highway, Rohtak Road, Village Rohad, Distt. Jhajjar (Haryana) and Published at 59/32, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi-110 005 - Editor : Rakesh Bhargava**

Material published in this part is the exclusive copyrighted property of Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd. and cannot be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means without written permission of the Publisher.

**Taxmann and its Editors do not necessarily agree with the views expressed in Magazine Section of SEBI & Corporate Laws. Views so expressed are the personal views of author(s).**

This publication is sold with the understanding that authors/editors and publishers are not responsible for the result of any action taken on the basis of this work nor for any error or omission to any person, whether a purchaser of this publication or not. All disputes are subject to jurisdiction of the Delhi High Court.

Email : [sales@taxmann.com](mailto:sales@taxmann.com)

Website: [www.taxmann.com](http://www.taxmann.com)

ISSN : 0972-818X

MODE OF CITATION [2022] 170 SCL... (..)  
TOTAL PAGES [128]

# C O N T E N T S

## STATUTES

### PRESS RELEASE

- ◆ Amendment to Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Online Delivery of Educational Course and Continuing Professional Education by Insolvency Professional Agencies and Registered Valuers Organisations) Guidelines, 2020 - PRESS RELEASE, DATED 29-3-2022 41

### RULES/AMENDMENT RULES

- ◆ Companies (Accounts) Second Amendment Rules, 2022 - Amendment in rules 3 and 12 - NOTIFICATION G.S.R. 235(E) [F. NO. 1/19/2013-CL-V-PART III], DATED 31-3-2022 41
- ◆ Companies (Indian Accounting Standards) Amendment Rules, 2022 - Amendment in Indian Accounting Standards (IND AS) 16, 37, 41, 101, 103 and 109 - NOTIFICATION G.S.R 255(E) [F. NO. 01/01/2009-CL-V (PART. XI)], DATED 23-3-2022 42
- ◆ Competition Commission of India (Procedure in Regard to the Transaction of Business Relating to Combinations) Amendment Regulations, 2022 - Amendment in Form IV and Substitution of Form II - NOTIFICATION NO. F. NO. CCI/CD/AMEND/COMB. REGL./2022, DATED 31-3-2022 47

## REPORTS : TABLE OF CASES

- ◆ BSE Ltd. v. KCCL Plastic Ltd. (NCLAT - New Delhi) 584
- ◆ Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs v. Sundaresh Bhatt (NCLAT - New Delhi) 596
- ◆ CFM Asset Reconstruction (P.) Ltd. v. Vishram Narayan Panchpor RP (NCLAT - New Delhi) 567
- ◆ Dhayanidhi Alagiri v. Directorate of Enforcement, Chennai (Mad.) 522
- ◆ Ibibo Group (P.) Ltd. v. MakeMyTrip (India) (P.) Ltd. (NCLT - Chd.) 556

- ◆ Liladhar Ladappa Kendole v. Solapur Janata Sahakari Bank Ltd. (Bom.) **540**
- ◆ Nishant P. Bhutada v. Tata Motors Ltd. (CCI) **552**

## **SUBJECT INDEX : CASES REPORTED**

### **COMPANIES ACT, 2013**

---

#### **■ Compromise and arrangement**

- Where consent of all shareholders and creditors of applicant companies *i.e.*, demerged and resulting companies had been received, requirement of convening of meeting of equity shareholders, preference shareholders, secured and unsecured creditors for approval of proposed scheme of arrangement was dispensed with - *Ibibo Group(P) Ltd. v. MakeMyTrip (India) (P) Ltd.* (NCLT - Chd.) **556**

### **COMPANIES ACT, 2013**

---

- Section 230 **556**

### **COMPETITION ACT, 2002**

---

#### **■ Power to issue interim orders**

- Where informant dealer preferred application seeking various interim reliefs under section 33 against OP-1, Tata Motors alleging essentially that OP-1 had illegally and unlawfully blocked access code which was required by informant to conduct business with OP-1 in terms of dealership agreement, however, it was found that dealership agreement had already lapsed, therefore, no case having been made out by informant for grant of interim relief - *Nishant P. Bhutada v. Tata Motors Ltd.* (CCI) **552**

### **COMPETITION ACT, 2002**

---

- Section 33 **552**

### **INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE, 2016**

---

#### **■ Corporate insolvency resolution process**

##### WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION

- Where although 'assignee' of loan had filed an application to withdraw CIRP application, RP had not presented said application before Adjudicating Authority and instead constituted Committee of Creditors, RP had defeated endeavour of assignee seeking pre-Committee of Creditors constitution withdrawal under regulation 30A(1)(a) and therefore, impugned order passed by Adjudicating Authority whereby it dismissed interlocutory application filed by assignee challenging action of RP was to be set aside - *CFM Asset Reconstruction (P) Ltd. v. Vishram Narayan Panchpor RP* (NCLAT - New Delhi) **567**

##### OPERATIONAL DEBT

- Listing Fees comes under ambit of 'Regulatory dues', which SEBI is entitled to recover and where an entity is registered under SEBI, it is under an obligation to follow Regulations prescribed by SEBI for recovery of its dues and said dues are not 'Operational Dues' but 'Regulatory Dues', which are not to be recovered under 'Operational Debt' - *BSE Ltd. v. KCCL Plastic Ltd.* (NCLAT- New Delhi) **584**

##### LIMITATION PERIOD

- Where respondent failed to pay requisite annual listing fees to appellant-Exchange from 31-5-2013, application filed under section 9 by appellant pursuant to demand notice dated 15-3-2019 was barred by limitation - *BSE Ltd. v. KCCL Plastic Ltd.* (NCLAT- New Delhi) **584**

#### **■ Overriding effect of code**

- Where corporate debtor imported goods but had abandoned same in customs warehouse

for several years and had not paid import duty, and, thereby relinquished its claim in respect of goods, goods lying in customs bonded warehouses could not be considered as assets of corporate debtor and thus, liquidator would have no power to take possession of goods without payment of customs duty - *Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs v. Sundaresh Bhatt* (NCLAT - New Delhi) **596**

---

#### **INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY CODE, 2016**

- Section 5(21) **584**
- Section 12A **567**
- Section 238 **597**
- Section 238A **584**

---

#### **PREVENTION OF MONEY LAUNDERING ACT, 2002**

##### **■ Offence of money-laundering**

- A *prima facie* satisfaction of Adjudicating Authority in a preventive proceedings regarding certain properties no way stand in way of prosecuting person accused of offence of money-laundering - *Dhayanidhi Alagiri v. Directorate of Enforcement, Chennai* (Mad.) **522**

##### **■ Offences triable by Special Courts**

- Both sections 44 and 45 commence with *non obstante* clause, indicating complaint in writing by a duly Authorised Officer to be taken cognizance by Special Judge without accused being committed, notwithstanding anything contained in Cr.P.C. and, therefore, plea of petitioner/accused regarding locus of Enforcement Directorate to file complaint without registering F.I.R. under section 154 of Cr.P.C. would not be maintainable - *Dhayanidhi Alagiri v. Directorate of Enforcement, Chennai* (Mad.) **522**

---

#### **PREVENTION OF MONEY LAUNDERING ACT, 2002**

- Section 3 **522**
- Section 44 **523**

---

#### **SECURITISATION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF FINANCIAL ASSETS AND ENFORCEMENT OF SECURITY INTEREST ACT, 2002**

##### **■ Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or District Magistrate to assist secured creditor in taking possession of secured asset**

- Duty of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate (CMM)/District Magistrate (DM) under section 14 is only to ascertain whether secured assets fall within his jurisdiction and to verify from bank or financial institutions whether notice under section 13(2) has been given or not, hence, once these two conditions are fulfilled, CMM/DM has no option, but to pass order; it does not lie within jurisdiction of CMM/DM under section 14 to enter upon an adjudication of merits of claim of bank - *Liladhar Ladappa Kendole v. Solapur Janata Sahakari Bank Ltd.* (Bom.) **540**

---

#### **SECURITISATION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF FINANCIAL ASSETS AND ENFORCEMENT OF SECURITY INTEREST ACT, 2002**

- Section 14 **540**

## **MAGAZINE**

- ◆ Emerging significance of Corporate Governance// *Jaya Sharma-Singhania* **49**
- ◆ Audit Committee under Companies Act, 2013 and SEBI (LODR) Regulations, 2015// *Dipti Mehta* **52**