



\$~25

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

CNR No. DLHC010078982026

+ **MISC. APPEAL(PMLA) 15/2026**

LATIFA KHATUN & ORS. Appellants

Through: **Mr. Arijit Sarkar, Adv.**

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT Respondent

Through: **Mr. Anurag Jain and Mr. Sagar Singh, Advs.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **20.08.2026**

1. This appeal has been filed under Section 42 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (hereinafter referred to as, 'PMLA') challenging the order dated 18.11.2025 passed by the learned Appellate Tribunal, SAFEMA at New Delhi, in appeals bearing no. FPA-PMLA-6453/DLI/2023, FPA-PMLA-6454/DLI/2023, FPA-PMLA-6455/DLI/2023, and FPA-PMLA-6456/DLI/2023, arising out of ECIR/KLZO/41/2020.

2. From the Memo of Parties itself, it is evident that all the appellants are residents of West Bengal. There is also no averment in the appeal that they carry on business or work for gain in Delhi.

3. Section 42 of the PMLA confers jurisdiction to hear an appeal only upon the High Court within whose jurisdiction the aggrieved



party “ordinarily resides or carries on business or personally works for gain”. We quote Explanation (i) to Section 42 of the PMLA as under:

“(i) the High Court within the jurisdiction of which the aggrieved party ordinarily resides or carries on business or personally works for gain; and”

4. We, vide our order dated 19.02.2026 in MISC. APPEAL(PMLA) 55/2025, titled “**Anup Kumar Singh v. Directorate of Enforcement**”, had held that merely because the Tribunal is situated at Delhi, will not confer jurisdiction to hear the appeal upon this Court.

5. The learned counsel for the appellant submits that, in the present case, the prosecution launched by the CBI, as also the complaint filed by the Directorate of Enforcement (‘ED’), are pending in Delhi. He further submits that in the reply filed by the respondent, there is no challenge to the maintainability of the present appeal.

6. We are not impressed with the above submissions of the learned counsel for the appellant.

7. Merely because the prosecution launched by the CBI or the complaint filed by the ED is pending in Delhi, in view of the specific provision contained in Explanation (i) to Section 42 of the PMLA, which we have quoted hereinabove, will not confer jurisdiction upon this Court.

8. Similarly, the lack of any challenge by the respondent to the maintainability of the present appeal, and even assuming that the



respondent has consented to the maintainability of the present appeal, cannot confer jurisdiction upon this Court. It is a settled law that jurisdiction cannot be conferred by consent of the parties, but only by law.

9. Accordingly, we find that the present appeal is not maintainable before this Court. The same is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, leaving it open to the appellants to avail of their remedies in accordance with law before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

AUGUST 20, 2026/gs/sk/Yg