

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.858 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District- BEGUSARAI

1. Suresh Nat Son of Late Ishak Nat Resident of Mohalla - Rahi Tola, Bakhari, P.S.
- Bakhari, District – Begusarai Petitioner

Versus

1. The Union of India
2. The Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Government of India, New Delhi
3. The Chairperson, Adjudicating Authority (Under PMLA), Room No. 24, 4th
Floor, Jeevandeep Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi
4. The Joint Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Lucknow
5. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna
6. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna
7. The Inspector General of Police, Economic Offence Unit, Government of Bihar,
Patna
8. The Director, Economic Directorate, Government of Bihar, Patna
.... Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Union of India : Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, CGC
For the State of Bihar : Mr. Anil Kumar, AC to SC X

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GOPAL PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 22-05-2015

Gopal Prasad, J. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the Union of India.

This writ petition has been filed against the order, dated 21.01.2014, passed by respondent no. 4 and communicated to the petitioner under F. No. ECR/02/PAT/2013/169 by which an order has been passed for provisional attachment of the properties, detailed in paragraph 11 of the period for a period of 180 days from the date of the order under Section 5(1) of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act and the remedy of the petitioner provides before the Adjudicating Authority, but, instead of proceeding there, the petitioner has

moved this Court.

The learned counsel for the Union of India submits that when alternative remedy is available, then, under extra ordinary jurisdiction this writ petition is not maintainable before this Court.

Hence, this petition is **disposed off** with a liberty to the petitioner to move the authority, concerned, and if the petitioner moves to the authority, he will consider the delay in pressing the remedy before this Court.

(Gopal Prasad, J)

SA/-

U	√	T	√
---	---	---	---