ITEM NO.2 COURT NO.2 SECTION PIL

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 267/2012

MADRAS BAR ASSOCIATION Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondent(s) (with office report)

WITH

(For Final Disposal)

SLP(C) No. 35248/2012
(With appln.(s) for substitution and Interim Relief and Office
Report)

W.P.(C) No. 1072/2013 (With appln.(s) for stay and appln.(s) for amendment of the petition and appln.(s) for directions and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 7219/2014 (With appln.(s) for directions and appln.(s) for exemption from filing c/c and appln.(s) for directions and appln.(s) for exemption from filing c/c and Interim Relief)

Date : 18/02/2015 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.S. THAKUR HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAFULLA C. PANT

For Petitioner(s) MR. Arvind P.Datar, Sr. Adv. Mr. Dhananjay Baijal, Adv.

Ms. Akansha, Adv.

Signature Not Verified

Mr. N.Sai, Adv.

Digitally signed by

Mr. Nikhil Nayyar,Adv.

Shashi Sareen
Date: 2015.02.19
07:33:00 IST
Reason:

Mr. Garvesh Kabra, Adv.

Mr. B. V. Balaram Das,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, AG, Ms. Madhvi Diwan, Adv.

Mr. Ashok Srivastava, adv.

Ms. V.Mohana, Adv.
Ms. Binu Tamta, Adv.
Ms. Rekha Pandey, Adv.

Ms. Sushma Suri, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Kapur, Adv. Mr. Anmol Chandan, Adv.

Ms. Priyanka Das, Adv.

Aishwarya Bhati, Adv. Ms.

Mr. Gopal, Adv.

Mr. Anshuman, Adv.

MS. Neha Meena, Adv.

Madhurina Ghosh, Adv. MS.

Mr. Hemendra Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Sonal Jain, Adv.

Mr. Rajiv M.Brahma, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following ORDER

Constitutional validity of Parts I-B and I-C of The Companies Act 1956 inserted by Companies Second Amendment Act of 2002 was examined by a Constitution Bench in Union of India Vs. R.Gandhi, President, Madras Bar Association 2010 (11) SCC 1 The operative part of the order passed in the said case was to the following effect:

"We, therefore dispose of these appeals, partly allowing them, as follows:

i) We uphold the decision of the High Court that the creation of the National Company Law Tribunal and the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal and vesting in them, the pwoers and jurisdiction exercised by the High Court in regard to company law matters, are not unconstitutional.

ii) We declare tht Parts I-B and I-C of the Act as presently structures, are unconstituional for the reasons stated in the preceding paragraph. However, Parts I-B and I-C of the Act, may be made operational by making suitable amendments, as indicated above, in addition to what the Union Government has alrady agreed to in pursuance of the impugned order of the High Court."

The Parliament has subsequent to the above judgment

enacted The Companies Act, 2013 by which Companies

Act,

1956 has been repealed. Besides Chapter XXVII of the new

establishment of Company Act envisages National Law

Tribunal and National Company Law Appellate Tribunal sought

in the manner and on the terms set out in the said chapter.

Constitutional validity of Chapter XXVII comprising

Sections 407 to 434 have been assailed by

```
ww.ecourtsindia
```

```
petitioner-association in Writ Petition (C)
                                                              No. 1072 of
2013 as ammended.
                           In conencted Writ Petition (C) No. 267
of 2012 the petitioner has prayed for
                                                    a mandamus directing
implementaion of the directions issued by the Cosntitution
Bench in R.Gandhi's
                           case supra.
                   heard Mr. Arvind
                                                                  senior
          Having
                                             P.Datar, learned
counsel and Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, learend A.G. at some length
     are of
               the
                     view
                             that substantial
                                                      questions of law
we
              interpretation
                                    of the provisions
                                                                 of
involving
                                                                       the
constitution falls for determination.
                                                     That apart since an
analogous challenge in the earlier round
                                                            of litigation
had been examined by a Constitution Bench of this Court, we
see no reason why the present writ petitions
                                                should also
not be referred to a larger Bench for an authoratative
pronouncement on the questions that have been raised.
                                                                  We
accordingly refer these writ petitions to be placed before
    Constitution Bench for final hearing and disposal.
Additional paper books shall be filed by the petitioners
within two weeks. The papers shall be placed before
Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India for constituting a
larger Bench.
```

SLP(C) Nos. 7219 of 2014 and 35248 of 2012:

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{De}-tagged}$.$$ To be listed separately after four weeks.

(Shashi Sareen) (Renu Diwan)
Court Master Court Master