

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

**Company Appeal (AT) No. 386 of 2017**

**IN THE MATTER OF :**

**Pravinbhai Manibhai Patel**

**... Appellant**

**Versus**

**Kanakbhai Ratilal Patel & Ors.**

**... Respondents**

**Present: Shri Tushar Hemani and Ms. Vaibhavi Parikh, Advocates for the Appellant.**

**Ms. M.G. Yogamaya, Advocate holding for Arguing Counsel for Respondent No. 1.**

**O R D E R**

**29.01.2018** Heard holding counsel for Respondent No. 1. She submits that the arguing counsel is not well and seeks time. Counsel for the appellant states that the learned counsel who was to argue had earlier contacted him that time could be sought as there is talk of compromise, which statement was denied by the client of the learned counsel for the appellant.

Looking to the different statements given from the two sides, today the matter is being adjourned but the respondents will note that on the next date, no adjournment will be granted for any reason.

List the appeal for hearing on **12<sup>th</sup> February, 2018.**

Till the next date, the impugned order shall remain stayed.

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

[Balvinder Singh]  
Member (Technical)