



Corporate Supervision Department
Company Law Division

Before Amina Aziz –Director (CSD)

In the matter of

Usman Textile Mills Limited

- Review sought for:**
1. Order dated April 14, 2016 of Director (CSD) under sections 158, read with section 476 of the Companies Ordinance, 1984 regarding non-holding of annual general meetings for the years 2009 to 2014 and
 2. Order dated April 14, 2016 of Director (CSD) under sections 158, read with section 476 of the Companies Ordinance, 1984 regarding non-holding of annual general meeting for the year ended June 30, 2015.

Date of Hearings: June 8, 2016, August 31, 2016, September 21, 2016, October 17, 2016 and November 7, 2016

Present: None

ORDER

Review Application under Section 484 of the Companies Ordinance, 1984

This Order shall dispose of the review application dated May 16, 2016 filed under section 484 of the Companies Ordinance, 1984 (the "Ordinance") to review the order dated April 14, 2016 (the "impugned order") passed by the Director (Corporate Supervision Department) under section 158 read with section 476 ibid whereby an aggregate penalties of Rs600,000 and Rs350,000 were imposed on the following applicants, being directors of Usman Textile Mills Limited (the "Company"), for non-holding of annual general meetings ("AGMs") for the years 2009 to 2015:

1	Mr. Noor Qadir	Chief Executive
2	Mr. Jehangeer Akbar	Director
3	Mr. Mushtaq Ahmed Jatoi	Director
4	Mr. M. Moosa Phulpoto	Director
5	Mr. Liaquat Ali Awan	Director
6	Mr. Jahanzaib	Director
7	Mr. Nasim Ahmed	Director

2. On receiving review applications for review of both orders, hearing in the matter was fixed for June 8, 2016 which was adjourned on request of the applicants and re-fixed for August 31, 2016. After that hearing in the matter were fixed thrice on the request of the applicants / Company for September 21, 2016, October 17, 2016 and November 7, 2016 but no one appeared on the date of hearing to plead the case. However, the Company's request for adjournment of hearing fixed for November 7, 2016 submitted vide its letter dated November 3, 2016 was not acceded to in view of the large number of adjournments as mentioned above and the Commission vide its letter dated November 7, 2016 informed the applicants that the Commission shall now proceed to pass an ex parte order on the basis of material available on record. The applicants vide Company's letter dated November 9, 2016 again requested to fix hearing in first week of December 2016 which was not responded as the Commission has already informed that an ex parte order on the basis of material available on record.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN
NIC Building, 63 Jinnah Avenue,
Islamabad, Pakistan

PABX: +92-51-9207091-4, Fax: +92-51-9100454, 9100471, Email: webmaster@secp.gov.pk, Website: www.secp.gov.pk



SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN

Corporate Supervision Department
Company Law Division

Continuation Sheet - 1 -

3. The brief facts of the case are that impugned order was passed after carrying out proceedings and providing opportunity of hearing, the Company has not held its annual general meetings ("AGMs") for the years ended June 30, 2009 to June 30, 2014 & for the year ended June 30, 2015

4. The Applicants have filed the application for review citing similar grounds, though very briefly, as were stated during the proceedings under section 158 of the Ordinance, which resulted in the impugned order. The Applicants have requested to set aside the impugned order whereby penalty was imposed on them as being bad in law. The applicants have contravened the provisions of section 158 by not holding AGMs for the years ended June 30, 2009 to June 30, 2014 and for the year ended June 30, 2015 for which aggregate penalties amounting to Rs600,000 and Rs350,000 were imposed on the applicants respectively after giving opportunity of hearing.

5. Relevant provisions of section 484 of the Ordinance are quoted below:

"Sub-section (2): The Commission or the registrar may, upon an application being made to it within sixty days from the date of any order passed by it otherwise than in revision under sub-section (1), or if its own motion, review such order; and such order in review shall be final."

In terms of the Commission's notification SRO 1003 (I)/2015 dated October 15, 2015, the Director (CSD) has the power to review the order originally passed by him in pursuance of the delegated powers.

6. It is important to highlight here that the Ordinance has been repealed while promulgating Companies Ordinance, 2016 ("Ordinance 2016"). However, provisions of Section 509(1)(f) of the Ordinance 2016 clearly provides that pending proceedings shall be concluded as provided in the Ordinance:

"509. Repeal and savings. — (1) The Companies Ordinance, 1984 (XLVII of 1984), hereinafter called as repealed Ordinance, shall stand repealed, except Part VIIIA consisting of sections 282A to 282N, from the date of coming into force of this Ordinance and the provisions of the said Part VIIIA along with all related or connected provisions of the repealed Ordinance shall be applicable mutatis mutandis to Non-banking Finance Companies in a manner as if the repealed Ordinance has not been repealed:

Provided that repeal of the repealed Ordinance shall not-

(f) affect any inspection, investigation, prosecution, legal proceeding or remedy in respect of any obligation, liability, penalty, forfeiture or punishment as aforesaid, and any such inspection, investigation, prosecution, legal proceedings or remedy may be made, continued or enforced and any such penalty, forfeiture or punishment may be imposed, as if this Ordinance has not been passed".

7. Before proceeding further it is necessary to elaborate upon the scope of a review in the light of judgments of higher courts. The honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan in the case of Haji Muhammad Boota and Others Versus Member (Revenue) BOR and Others (2010 SCMR 1049), referring to numerous previous judgments of the apex court, has held as under:



SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN

Corporate Supervision Department
Company Law Division

Continuation Sheet - 2 -

"The principles upon which a review can be granted are well-settled, i.e. there must be some new point based upon discovery of new evidence which could not with diligence, have been found out on the previous occasion. A review petition is not competent where neither any new and important matter or evidence has been discovered nor is any mistake or error apparent on the face of the record. Such error may be an error of fact or of law but it must be self-evident and floating on surface and not requiring any elaborate discussion or process of ratiocination. Orders based on erroneous assumption of material facts, or without advertent to a provision of law, or a departure from undisputed construction of law and Constitution, may, amount to error apparent on face of the record. Error, on the other hand, must not only be apparent but must also have a material bearing on fate of case and be not of inconsequential import. If judgment or finding, although suffering from an erroneous assumption of facts, is sustainable on other grounds available on record, review is not justifiable notwithstanding error being apparent on the face of the record. Where order under review did not appear to have been vitiated by any error on face of the record nor any other good and sufficient reason was given for review of order. Petition for review was dismissed."

8. I have examined the subject application considering the scope of review in the light of judgment of the apex court and the submissions made by the Applicants as mentioned hereinabove which appear to be devoid of merit. The Applicants have repeated similar submissions that were made by them during the original proceedings that resulted in the impugned order whereof fine has been imposed on them. I have observed that the Applicants have neither brought up any new and important matter or evidence nor has he been able to highlight any mistake or error of facts or law apparent on the face of the record. Moreover, applicants did not appear before the undersigned to plead the case as adjournments were sought several time by the applicants. The amount of penalty, which in my view commensurate with the level of the default, cannot be waived of. As the applicants have violated the provisions of section 158 ibid by not holding AGMs for the last six years from 2009 to 2014 and for the year ended June 30, 2015. Moreover, I do not find any reason to grant stay in the proceedings till disposal of appeal pending before the Appellate Bench. Therefore, in the light of the facts on record, the limited scope of review and failure of the Applicants to highlight any material error or mistake in record of the case, the review applications are hereby dismissed.

Amina Aziz
Director
Corporate Supervision Department

Announced:
December 15, 2016
Islamabad

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100