

Sharda Motor Industries Ltd.

SMIL: BSE/NSE: 17-18/0711-01

7th November, 2017

BSE Limited

Department of Corporate Services Pheroze Jeejeebhoy Towers Dalal Street, Mumbai - 400 001 (SCRIP CODE - 535602) National Stock Exchange of India Limited Exchange Plaza, 5th Floor Plot No. C/1, G Block Bandra - Kurla Complex, Mumbai - 400 051 (Symbol - SHARDAMOTR) (Series - EQ)

<u>Sub:</u> Intimation under Regulation 30 of Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015

Dear Sir/ Madam

In the matter of Company Petition 'CP No. 242 (ND)/2017' filed with National Company Law Tribunal, Delhi ('NCLT'), and in continuation of our previous intimations in this regard, please find enclosed herewith a copy of the interim order passed by the NCLT dated 27th October, 2017.

Please take the same on record.

Thanking you, Yours faithfully,

For SHARDA MOTOR INDUSTRIES LIMITED

Nitin Vishnoi / Company Secretary

NEW DELININGS * OLD

Regd. Office: D-188, Okhla Industrial Area, Phase-I, New Delhi - 110 020 (INDIA)

Tel.: 91-11-47334100, Fax: 91-11-26811676

E-mall: smil@shardamotor.com, Website: www.shardamotor.com

CIN NO-L74899DL1986PLC023202

NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL **NEW DELHI BENCH**

CP No. 242 (ND)/2017

CORAM:

PRESENT: SH. S. K. MOHAPATRA

HON'BLE MEMBER(T)

SMT. INA MALHOTRA HON'BLE MEMBER (J)

ATTENDANCE-CUM-ORDER SHEET OF THE HEARING BEFORE NEW DELHI BENCH OF THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL ON 27.10.2017

NAME OF THE COMPANY: M/s Sharda Motor Industries Ltd. Vs. M/s Toyo Sharda India Pvt. Ltd.

SECTION OF THE COMPANIES ACT: 241/242

S.NO. NAME DESIGNATION REPRESENTATION SIGNATURE

For the Petitioner (s)

: Mr. Jayant Mehta, Advocate

Ms. Manisha Chaudhary, Advocate

Mr. Karan Malhotra, Advocate

For the Respondent (s) : Mr. Virender Ganda, Sr. Advocate with

Mr. Anuj Shah, Advocate Mr. Nripi Jolly, Advocate

Mr. Akshat Gupta, Advocate for R7

ORDER

The main grievance of the Petitioner is that Board Meetings are held by the Respondent No. 1, in which one of their Directors viz Respondent No.7 did not receive any notice whatsoever. The other grievance of the Petitioner company is that the statutory records of the Respondent no. 1 company are not kept in the registered office and therefore they cannot examine them.

Ld. Sr. Counsel appearing for the Respondent has taken us through the background. The Petitioner company holds 50% equity in Respondent No.1. Two of its nominated Directors are Respondent No.2 and Respondent No.7. The Petitioner company has alleged Respondent

(Lekhraj Singh)

My.

No.2, being in total control of the affairs of the company. Aggrieved by being kept away from the working of the company, Respondent No.7 has chosen a back route through the Petitioner to seek relief. Respondent No.2 and 7 are brothers. Family dissensions are effecting the working of the Respondent No.1 company. The Respondent Company has pointed out that the books of accounts have been removed only at the instance of Respondent no. 7 in whose premises the registered office was situated.

After hearing both parties, they are directed to file their written synopsis along with the citations they seek to rely upon in respect of their case. Since the Board meeting held on 12th April, 2017 and 19th May, 2017 are also being impugned, it would be relevant to see what the Agenda was and why the notice was not issued. The same be filed as an affidavit.

To come up on 30.01.2018 for further consideration.

(S. K. Mohapatra)

Member (T)

(Ina Malhotra) Member (J)