

March 13, 2023

**BSE Limited** 

Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers, Dalal Street, Fort, Mumbai 400 001 National Stock Exchange of India Limited

Exchange Plaza, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Plot No. C/1, G Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai 400 051

Dear Sir(s),

Sub.: Disclosure in terms of Regulation 60 of Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015

Further, to our letter dated March 3, 2023 as regards Resolution Plan of the Company being conducted by its Lenders in terms of RBI Circular No. RBI/2018-19/ 203, DBR.No.BP.BC.45/21.04.048/2018-19 dated June 7, 2019 on Prudential Framework for Resolution of Stressed Assets, in accordance with the approved Resolution Plan and Distribution Mechanism, submitted by Authum Investment and Infrastructure Limited, read with the Order dated March 3, 2023 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Authum Investment and Infrastructure Limited versus R.K. Mohatta Family Trust and Others (SLP (Civil) Number 411 of 2023), Debenture Holders will be paid as per the respective entitlement of the debenture holders as on the date of Resolution Plan in terms thereof, in full and final settlement of their dues and claims, towards extinguishment and redemption of the debentures of the Company held by them and the Company has fixed March 26, 2023 as the record date for the said purpose.

Copy of the Order of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India is enclosed.

Accordingly, we submit the disclosure in terms of Regulation 60 of Chapter V of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, enclosed as Annexure 'A'

Thanking you.

Yours faithfully,

For Reliance Home Finance Limited

#### **Parul Jain**

Company Secretary & Compliance Officer

Encl.: As Above.

CC to

National Securities Depository Limited IDBI Trusteeship Services Limited KFin Technologies Limited

Central Depository Services (India) Limited Catalyst Trusteeship Limited

## Reliance Home Finance Limited



## Annexure 'A'

Sr. No.	ISIN	Corporate Action
1	INE217K07034	Redemption
2	INE217K07117	Redemption
3	INE217K07208	Redemption
4	INE217K07216	Redemption
5	INE217K07240	Redemption
6	INE217K07257	Redemption
7	INE217K07281	Redemption
8	INE217K07315	Redemption
9	INE217K07323	Redemption
10	INE217K07430	Redemption
11	INE217K07497	Redemption
12	INE217K07521	Redemption
13	INE217K07646	Redemption
14	INE217K07653	Redemption
15	INE217K07661	Redemption
16	INE217K07679	Redemption
17	INE217K07729	Redemption
18	INE217K07737	Redemption
19	INE217K07752	Redemption
20	INE217K07778	Redemption
21	INE217K07786	Redemption
22	INE217K07828	Redemption
23	INE217K07836	Redemption
24	INE217K07877	Redemption
25	INE217K07901	Redemption
26	INE217K07927	Redemption
27	INE217K07919	Redemption
28	INE217K07943	Redemption
29	INE217K07950	Redemption
30	INE217K07968	Redemption
31	INE217K07984	Redemption
32	INE217K07992	Redemption
33	INE217K07AA8	Redemption
34	INE217K07AH3	Redemption
35	INE217K07AI1	Redemption
36	INE217K07AJ9	Redemption
37	INE217K07AK7	Redemption
38	INE217K07AM3	Redemption
39	INE217K07AO9	Redemption
40	INE217K07AP6	Redemption
41	INE217K07AR2	Redemption

## Reliance Home Finance Limited



Sr. No.	ISIN	Corporate Action
42	INE217K07AS0	Redemption
43	INE217K07AT8	Redemption
44	INE217K07AU6	Redemption
45	INE217K07AV4	Redemption
46	INE217K07AY8	Redemption
47	INE217K07AZ5	Redemption
48	INE217K07BA6	Redemption
49	INE217K07BB4	Redemption
50	INE217K07BC2	Redemption
51	INE217K07BD0	Redemption
52	INE217K07BG3	Redemption
53	INE217K07BH1	Redemption
54	INE217K07BI9	Redemption
55	INE217K07BE8	Redemption
56	INE217K07AW2	Redemption
57	INE217K07AX0	Redemption
58	INE217K07AB6	Redemption / Partial Redemption
59	INE217K07AC4	Redemption / Partial Redemption
60	INE217K07AD2	Redemption / Partial Redemption
61	INE217K07AE0	Redemption / Partial Redemption
62	INE217K07AF7	Redemption
63	INE217K07AG5	Redemption / Partial Redemption
64	INE217K08271	Redemption
65	INE217K08289	Redemption
66	INE217K08016	Redemption
67	INE217K08024	Redemption
68	INE217K08032	Redemption
69	INE217K08040	Redemption
70	INE217K08057	Redemption
71	INE217K08065	Redemption
72	INE217K08073	Redemption
73	INE217K08081	Redemption
74	INE217K08107	Redemption
75	INE217K08123	Redemption
76	INE217K08248	Redemption
77	INE217K08255	Redemption
78	INE217K08263	Redemption
79	INE217K08131	Redemption / Partial Redemption
80	INE217K08149	Redemption / Partial Redemption
81	INE217K08156	Redemption / Partial Redemption
82	INE217K08164	Redemption / Partial Redemption
83	INE217K08172	Redemption / Partial Redemption

### Reliance Home Finance Limited



Sr. No.	ISIN	Corporate Action
84	INE217K08180	Redemption / Partial Redemption
85	INE217K08198	Redemption / Partial Redemption
86	INE217K08206	Redemption / Partial Redemption
87	INE217K08214	Redemption / Partial Redemption
88	INE217K08222	Redemption / Partial Redemption
89	INE217K08230	Redemption / Partial Redemption

### Reliance Home Finance Limited

# **NON-REPORTABLE**

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. OF 2023 (Arising out of SLP(C) No. 411 of 2023)

AUTHUM INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE LIMITED

...APPELLANT(S)

**VERSUS** 

R.K. MOHATTA FAMILY TRUST AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENT(S)

# **WITH**

CIVIL APPEAL NO. OF 2023
(Arising out of SLP(C) No. 1078 of 2023)

# JUDGMENT

## B.R. GAVAI, J.

- **1.** Leave granted.
- These appeals challenge the order of the High Court of Judicature at Bombay, dated 16<sup>th</sup> December 2022, vide which the High Court dismissed the Interim Application (L) No. 33514 of 2022 in Commercial Suit (L) No. 162 of 2022 filed by Reliance Home Finance Limited (hereinafter referred to as 'RHFL'), respondent No. 2 herein, under Section 151 of

the Civil Procedure Code, 1908 (for short, "CPC"), seeking approval of the Resolution Plan (for short, "RP") pertaining to its dissolution, in light of the judgment of this Court in the case of **Securities and Exchange Board of India v. Rajkumar Nagpal and Others**<sup>1</sup>. The appeal arising out of SLP(C) No. 1078 of 2023 is filed by RHFL and appeal arising out of SLP(C) No. 411 of 2023 is filed by Authum Investment and Infrastructure Limited (hereinafter referred to as "AIIL"), a non-banking financial corporation, which had originally proposed the RP for RHFL.

- 3. The facts herein are taken from the appeal arising out of SLP(C) No. 411 of 2023 filed by AIIL, which, in brief, are as follows:
- 3.1 RHFL executed a number of Debenture Trust Deeds, of which nine were executed with the IDBI Trusteeship Services Limited, respondent No. 3 herein, for issuance of debentures on a private placement basis, having face value of Rs. 5 lakhs. These debentures were issued on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2018. It is pertinent to note that RHFL had, previously, taken

<sup>1 2022</sup> SCC Online SC 1119

upon itself substantial debt through loans from several banks and financial institutions.

- 3.2 In May 2019, RHFL defaulted on its loan obligations to various lenders. The outstanding debt was quantified to around Rs. 11,540 crore. It is important to note that its sister concern, Reliance Commercial Finance Limited (hereinafter referred to as 'RCFL'), had previously defaulted on its loan obligations in March 2019.
- 3.3 On 6<sup>th</sup> July 2019, a consortium of lenders led by the lead bank, i.e., Bank of Baroda, respondent No. 4 herein, entered into an Inter-Creditor Agreement (hereinafter referred to as 'ICA') in terms of clause 10 of the Reserve Bank of India (Prudential Framework for Resolution of Stressed Assets) Directions, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as 'RBI Circular'). As per clause 10 of the RBI Circular, the lenders may enter into an ICA for implementation of a RP.
- **3.4** On 26<sup>th</sup> August 2019, RHFL committed default in relation to the Debenture Trust Deeds issued as well.
- **3.5** In January 2020, IDBI Trusteeship Services Ltd., respondent No. 3 herein, filed a company petition bearing No.

138 of 2020 before National Company Law Tribunal, Mumbai (NCLT) under Section 71 (10) of the Companies Act, 2013 against RHFL and its holding company Reliance Capital Ltd., to make payment of Rs. 2,850 crore with interest due and payable to the debenture holders of RHFL, which includes the appellant herein.

- for RHFL was submitted by AIIL on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2021, which, thereafter, was approved by the consortium of lenders who had entered into an ICA. Pertinently, 96% of the ICA lenders approved the RP. On 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021, a press note to that effect was published. On the same date, the NCLT, in the aforementioned company petition, directed RHFL to repay the debt owed to the debenture holders within five months. An appeal being Company Appeal (AT) No. 73 of 2021 against this order is pending before the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal, New Delhi (NCLAT).
- 3.7 It is pertinent to note that the RHFL RP, as submitted by AIIL and approved by the ICA lenders, provided that 19,353 small debenture holders, comprising of

individuals and HUFs having an exposure up to Rs. 5 lakhs, would get 100% of their principal dues under the RP.

- 3.8 Since the RBI Circular only regulated the debts owed to Banks/Financial Institutions, the consent of the debenture holders had to be taken as per a SEBI Circular dated 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2020, titled 'Standardisation of procedure to be followed by Debenture Trustee(s) in case of 'Default' by Issuers of listed debt securities'.
- 3.9 The SEBI Circular prescribes that the voting by the debenture holders, before entering into an ICA, shall mean an approval of not less than 75% of investors by value and 60% by number at ISIN level. An ISIN is a 12-digit alphanumeric code that uniquely identifies a specific security. The numbers are allocated by a country's respective national numbering agency, which, in India, is the NSDL.
- 3.10 In pursuance of the requirement prescribed by the SEBI Circular, a commercial suit bearing No. 162 of 2022 was originally filed by R.K. Mohatta Family Trust, respondent No.1 herein and one of the debenture holders of RHFL, before the High Court of Bombay in 2021, seeking voting by the

debenture holders on the RP. The High Court, vide its order dated 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022, directed for a meeting of the debenture holders to be convened to allow the debenture holders to vote on the RP. Vide another order dated 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022, the High Court further directed that the results of the voting would be placed in a sealed envelope before the High Court.

- **3.11** The voting on the RHFL RP took place on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2022, and the results thereof were submitted before the High Court on 10<sup>th</sup> August 2022.
- 3.12 Thereafter, an Interim Application being IA No. 3928 of 2022 in Commercial Suit (L) No. 27568 of 2021 was filed by RHFL seeking disclosure of the voting result, which was allowed by the High Court vide order dated 28<sup>th</sup> September 2022, in order to assist the Court as to whether the requisite majority, as prescribed by the SEBI Circular, had been achieved or not.
- **3.13** A perusal of the result would reveal that 869 of the 919 debenture holders who had participated in the meeting voted in favour of the RP, i.e., 94.55%.

- **3.14** While the above proceedings in relation to RHFL continued, a RP for the sister concern RCFL was also submitted by AIIL, which too was approved by the consortium of lenders who had entered into an ICA. The two RPs are substantially similar in so far that the debenture holders of both entities, up to a certain exposure threshold, would get 100% of their principal dues.
- 3.15 RCFL too, the High Court, separate proceedings, had ordered for a meeting of debenture holders to be convened. SEBI, respondent No. 5 herein, filed an appeal before the Division Bench of the High Court against convening of the meeting on the ground that voting procedure was not as per the SEBI Circular but as per the process provided under the Debenture Trust Deeds entered into by the parties therein. The appeal was dismissed, with the Division Bench noting that the SEBI Circular could not be applied retrospectively and that the voting process would be governed by the Debenture Trust Deed. Aggrieved thereby, SEBI preferred an appeal before this Court.

- **Rajkumar Nagpal** (supra), allowed the appeal, insofar as it held that the SEBI Circular would have retrospective application. However, this Court noted that the RCFL RP was extremely beneficial to debenture holders in as much that, for those with exposure upto Rs. 10 lakhs would receive 100% of their principal amount, whereas those with exposure of more than Rs. 10 lakhs would receive 29.96% of the principal amount, which is greater than the amount of recovery made by secured lenders, who would receive 24.96% of the principal amount.
- Article 142 of the Constitution of India, approved the RCFL RP with the caveat that the dissenting debenture holders would be provided an option to either accept the plan or stand outside the plan and pursue other legal means to recover their entitled dues.
- **3.18** In light of the decision in the case of *Rajkumar Nagpal* (supra), RHFL filed an Interim Application being Interim Application (L) No. 33514 of 2022 in Commercial Suit

No. 162 of 2022, under Section 151 of the CPC, seeking approval of the RP pertaining to it on the same terms as ordered by this Court in respect of RCFL in *Rajkumar Nagpal* (supra), for the two cases were nearly identical and any unscrambling of the RHFL RP would prove time consuming and inimical to the interests of the debenture holders.

- The High Court, vide the impugned order, dismissed the Interim Application, holding that the power to mould relief and approve the RP, as had been done by this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution of India in the case of *Rajkumar Nagpal* (supra) could not be done by the High Court in exercise of its inherent powers under Section 151 of the CPC. Hence, these appeals.
- **4.** We have heard Shri K.K. Venugopal and Shri Dhruv Mehta, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of both the appellants, Shri K.V. Viswanathan, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Bank of Baroda and Canara Bank, and Shri Venkatraman, learned Additional Solicitor General (ASG) appearing on behalf of SEBI.

5. Shri Venugopal and Shri Mehta submitted that the High Court itself has observed that this Court had found that the RP in the case of RCFL was beneficial to the debenture holders upto the exposure threshold of Rs. 10 lakhs. It is submitted that if the RP in the case of RHFL, which is a sister concern of RCFL, is accepted, 19,353 debenture holders out of 20,843 debenture holders, having an exposure of upto Rs.5 lakhs, would receive 100% of the principal amount. It is submitted that, even as per Bank of Baroda, which is the lead bank in the ICA, the total percentage of ICA lenders who have accepted the RP is 96%. It is further submitted that if the RP is not accepted, RHFL would be In such a situation, driven into liquidation. 19.353 debenture holders, who are getting 100% of the principal amount under the RP, would not, in any case, get that amount. In such a situation, it is difficult to ascertain as to when and to what extent, the secured and unsecured creditors would recover their portion of the amounts indicated in the RP.

- 6. Shri Viswanathan has also submitted that they have no objection if the RP is accepted, provided that the amount should be paid prior to the end of the Financial Year 2022-23, i.e., 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023.
- Shri Venkatraman, on the contrary, submitted that **7**. there are three types of debenture holders. The first are those who have accepted the RP, the second are the ones who have dissented against the RP, and the third are the ones who have abstained from voting on the RP or were present but had not voted. He submitted that the option of opting out of RP, which has been given by this Court in the case of **Rajkumar Nagpal** (supra), should be given to both the dissenting as well as the debenture holders who have abstained or were present but not voted, i.e., types 2 and 3 of The learned ASG submitted that the debenture holders. claims of many of the debenture holders are pending before In the event that the RP is accepted, it will the NCLAT. prejudicially affect the rights of such debenture holders. He submitted that the SEBI Circular, particularly in paragraphs 6.2 and 6.6 thereof, specifically requires that there has to be

a negative consent or positive consent. He further submitted that as per the said SEBI Circular, the consent of majority of investors would mean an approval of not less than 75% of investors by value of outstanding debt and 60% of investors by number at ISIN level. He submitted that the condition with regard to approval of 60% of investors by ISIN level is not satisfied in the present case. He submitted that, undisputedly, this requirement is not satisfied and as such, if the RP is to be accepted, the option should be given to type 2 and 3 debenture holders to either accept the RP or for a right to stand outside and pursue other legal means to recover their entitled dues.

- 8. In this respect, we may gainfully refer to paragraphs
  108 and 109 of the judgment in the case of *Rajkumar*Nagpal (supra), which read thus:
  - "108. The above table highlights that small investors, especially those whose exposure is up to INR 10 lakhs, are benefiting to the extent of 100% of their principal amount. Even debenture holders whose exposure is more than 10 lakhs are receiving 29.96% of their principal amount. In comparison, the secured ICA lenders would receive 24.96% of their principal amount, which is lower than the recovery made by the debenture

holders. It is also important to highlight that none of the debenture holders have raised any grievance with regard to the proposed compromise. In such a situation, application of the SEBI Circular, though right in law, may lead to unjust outcomes for the retail debenture holders if this court were to reverse the entire course of action which has occurred in the present case.

- 109. The different voting mechanism proposed under the SEBI Circular will further delay the resolution process and potentially disrupt the efforts undertaken by the stakeholders, including the retail debenture holders. Such unscrambling of the resolution process will not only prove time-consuming, but may also adversely affect the agreed realized gains to the retail debenture holders, who have already consented to the negotiated settlement before the High Court."
- **9.** In the present case also, small investors, whose exposure is up to Rs. 5 lakhs, are benefiting to the extent of 100% of their principal amount. Even debenture holders whose exposure is more than Rs. 5 lakhs are receiving 23.24% of their principal amount, similar to the case of *Rajkumar Nagpal* (supra).
- 10. We find that the facts in the present case are identical to the facts in the case of *Rajkumar Nagpal* (supra). In the present case also, we find that a different voting mechanism proposed under the SEBI Circular will

further delay the resolution process and potentially disrupt the efforts undertaken by the stakeholders, including the retail debenture holders. In the present case also, such unscrambling of the resolution process will not only prove time consuming but may also adversely affect the agreed realized gains to the retail debenture holders, who have already consented to the negotiated settlement before the High Court. We find that in the present case also, we should extend the benefit under Article 142 of the Constitution of India to the retail debenture holders. We are inclined to issue such directions to mould the relief in view of the particular facts and circumstances in the present case, which are similar to that in the case of **Rajkumar Nagpal** (supra). In any case, we also propose to protect the rights of the holders who dissenting debenture stand outside proposed RP framed under the lender's ICA and seek to pursue other legal remedies.

We, therefore, in exercise of the powers under Article142 of the Constitution of India, allow the RP preferred by

AIIL qua the debenture holders, except the dissenting debenture holders.

12. On the same lines as in the case of **Rajkumar** 

Nagpal (supra), we direct that the dissenting debenture

holders should be provided an option to accept the terms of

the RP. Alternatively, the dissenting debenture holders will

have a right to stand outside the proposed RP framed under

the lender's ICA and pursue other legal remedies to recover

their entitled dues.

13. In the result, the appeals stand disposed of in the

above terms. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand

disposed of.

**14.** The AIIL is directed to make the payments prior to

31st March 2023.

.....J. [B.R. GAVAI]

.....J. [ARAVIND KUMAR]

NEW DELHI; MARCH 03, 2023.