

**NATIONAL COMPANY LAW APPELLATE TRIBUNAL**  
**PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

**Comp. App. (AT) (Ins) No. 675 & 676 of 2026 &**  
**I.A. No. 2647, 2648 of 2026**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**Radha Buildtech (India) Pvt. Ltd.**

**...Appellant(s)**

**Versus**

**Solitaire Infomedia Pvt. Ltd. Through Jalesh Kumar ...Respondent(s)**  
**Grover Resolution Professional & Ors.**

**Present:**

**For Appellant : Mr. Pooja Saigal, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Kabir Chhilwar, Mr. Nivesh Dixit, Advocates**

**For Respondents : Mr. Abhishek Anand, Advocate**

**Mr. Palash Singhai, Mr. Harshal Sareen,  
Ms. Aashima Gautam, Advocates for R3**

**Mr. Aditya Madan, Advocate for R4**

**ORDER**  
**(Hybrid Mode)**

**06.05.2026** Heard Ld. Counsel for Appellant and Ld. Counsel appearing for Respondents.

2. This Appeal has been filed against the order dated 12/02/2026 passed by National Company Law Tribunal, Court V, New Delhi in I.A. No 3373/2025.

3. I.A. was filed seeking a direction for consolidation of Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process of M/s Solitaire Infomedia Pvt. Ltd, Corporate Debtor, with Premia Project Limited into single proceedings. Both the CDs have filed the Application for Consolidation.

4. Appellant, before us is a Resolution Application of Premia Project Limited, who is challenging the order directing for consolidation of the CIRP.

5. It is submitted by Ld. Counsel for Appellant that creditors are the same and the Resolution Plan had already been submitted by Appellant which was approved by Committee of Creditors of M/s Premia Project Limited.

6. Shri Abhishek Anand, Ld. Counsel for Respondent submitted that in view of the Consolidation of CIRP, the issuance of Form G is consequential action and joint CIRP of both the CDs have to commence, which was directed by the Adjudicating Authority.

7. We have heard the Counsels for the Parties and perused the records.

8. When both the CDs themselves have prayed for the consolidation of the CIRP, we do not find any error in the order of the Adjudicating Authority directing for such Consolidation for initiation of joint CIRP of both the Corporate Debtors.

9. In so far as the submission of the Appellant that creditors are same and Plan has been approved by the CoC, we are of the view that the process has to restart and in the joint CIRP, the steps, as per the IBC and the Regulations have to be taken afresh.

10. We further clarify that it shall always be open for the Appellant to submit Resolution Plan when appropriate time comes, if eligible, for consideration.

11. Ld. Counsel for Appellant submitted that the Appellant is not against the consolidation but the consolidation is sought otherwise. We are of the view that the said submission cannot be accepted when consolidation has been made, both has to be treated to be consolidated into one CIRP Process.

12. With the above observations, **Appeal dismissed.**

**[Justice Ashok Bhushan]**  
**Chairperson**

**[Barun Mitra]**  
**Member (Technical)**

*Prerana/md*