

# PIONEER URBAN LAND & INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED VS PRESIDIA ARAYA RESIDENTS WELFARE ASSOCIATION

DOWNLOAD JUDGEMENT: [CLICK HERE](#)

## Case Summary:

### 1. Details of the Parties:

- **Appellant:** Pioneer Urban Land & Infrastructure Ltd.
- **Respondent:** Presidia Araya Residents Welfare Association

### 2. Facts of the Case:

- The **Respondent** filed an application under Section 7 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016, seeking the initiation of the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) against the **Appellant**, Pioneer Urban Land & Infrastructure Ltd.
- The **Adjudicating Authority (National Company Law Tribunal – NCLT, Chandigarh)** considered the issue of maintainability of the application before proceeding with the case.
- The **Adjudicating Authority** held the application to be maintainable in its order dated 13.12.2024, ruling that the debt owed by the corporate debtor exceeded the threshold limit of Rs. 1 crore.
- The **Appellant** challenged the decision, raising concerns over the Adjudicating Authority's handling of the maintainability issue and the reliance on a judgment that was later set aside by the Supreme Court.

### 3. **Issues Involved:**

- Whether the **application under Section 7 of the IBC** was maintainable.
- Whether the **Adjudicating Authority** erred by addressing the merits of the case while deciding the maintainability of the application.
- Whether the **Adjudicating Authority** improperly relied on a judgment that had been subsequently set aside by the Supreme Court.
- Whether the **Applicants** (Residents Welfare Association) were properly qualified to file the application as they were not individual members of the association.

### 4. **Judgment:**

- The **Appellate Tribunal** (NCLAT) upheld the **NCLT's** decision that the application under Section 7 was maintainable.
- The **Appellate Tribunal** observed that while it was not necessary for the NCLT to separately consider the maintainability at the outset, it was within its discretion to do so, and in this case, the decision to proceed was not erroneous.
- The Appellate Tribunal rejected the **Appellant's** argument regarding the reliance on the judgment in 'M/s. Vipul Greens Residents Welfare Association vs. Vipul Limited,' which was later set aside by the Supreme Court.
- The **Appellate Tribunal** also noted that issues concerning the nature of debt and the qualification of the Applicants were matters to be determined during the merits of the application and did not affect the maintainability at this stage.

### 5. **Conclusion:**

- The **Appeal** was disposed of with the **Appellate Tribunal's** observation that the question of **maintainability** stood closed in favor of the **Respondent**.

- The **Adjudicating Authority** was directed to proceed with the **Section 7 Application on its merits**, addressing issues related to the nature of debt, default, and other pertinent matters in accordance with the law.
- The **Appellate Tribunal** effectively closed the debate on the maintainability of the application and left the merits of the case to be decided by the **NCLT**.