

*** IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of Reserve: July 27, 2010

Date of Order: August 12, 2010

+ CRL.M.C. 10/2010 & CrI.M.A.Nos. 1077/2010 & 2680/2010

%

12.08.2010

INDU KUMAR & ANR.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shyam Moorjani,
Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocates with Ms. Indu
Kumar

versus

CBI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Harish Gulati, Advocate with
Mr. Anindya Malhotra, Advocates for CBI

JUSTICE SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporter or not?
3. Whether judgment should be reported in Digest?

JUDGMENT

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing order of learned Special Judge dated 11th July, 2009, whereby the learned Special Judge dismissed an application of the petitioner for release of original title deed of property and the photocopies of documents seized by CBI in investigation of RC No. ACU IX/CBI/2008/04.

2. The applicant is a company engaged in sale and purchase of immovable properties. The accused in this case was booked for accumulating huge assets

disproportionate to his income and it was found by CBI that the accused was using the name of this company to invest ill-gotten money. The company was being run by the wife of accused. Documents showing investments by the company, sources of income of the company and other features of the company were seized by the CBI and it was found by CBI that the company was existing only on papers with fictitious shareholders whose addresses were false.

3. It was submitted by the respondent that earlier also photocopies of some shares were supplied to the applicant and the applicant, on the basis of those photocopies, sold the shares to third parties. Learned Special Judge observed that since the investigation was in respect of disproportionate assets and the company was being used just to invest the ill-gotten money, it would not be appropriate to release the photocopies of documents and dismissed the application.

4. The investigation done by CBI has revealed that the company in question was existing on papers only. It was being run by the wife of accused and it was being used as a front for investment of ill-gotten money of her husband. The documents pertaining to various transactions of the company were seized by the CBI in order to establish the case of disproportionate assets against the accused. In these circumstances, I consider that if photocopies of documents are supplied to the applicant/company, there is

every possibility that company may try to create some further evidence or may try to destroy some evidence. The original title deed seized by the CBI also cannot be released in favour of the company for the said reason. It is settled law that the Court in appropriate case can pierce the veil of the company and can rule that the company has to be identified with the shareholders and Directors. Since in this case some shareholders of the company have been found fictitious and the company was being run by the wife of accused, I consider that the Court can ignore the existence of the company for the time being till the investigation is complete.

5. I, therefore, find no force in this petition. The petition is hereby dismissed.

AUGUST 12 , 2010
acm

SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA, J.