

\$~86

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 18.04.2017

+ **W.P.(C) 3143/2017**

P K M SELVAM

..... Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr Brijdender Chahar, Senior Advocate with Mr S.Nithin and Ms Preeti Singh.

For the Respondents : Mr Vikas Mahajan and Mr S.S.Rai for R-1.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

18.04.2017

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner, by the present petition, seeks a direction to the Adjudicating Authority to grant time to the petitioner to file English translation of all the Tamil documents in compliance of Regulation 3 of the Adjudicating Authority (Procedure) Regulations, 2013 issued under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA, 2002).
2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that in terms of Regulation 3 of the said Regulations, all documents have to be in language either Hindi or English.

3. It is contended that along with the show-cause notice, the petitioner was served with documents in Tamil language. The petitioner has already filed a reply, however, in support of the reply, the petitioner had to rely on certain documents, which are in Tamil language and number of pages of the documents are approximately 434.

4. It is contended that though the petitioner has filed a reply but due to paucity of time, the documents in Tamil Language could not be translated.

5. It is prayed that petitioner be granted three weeks time to translate the Tamil documents into English language and file the same.

6. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would not be required to file any additional reply or documents but only requires time to translate the documents already filed and file the translations.

7. Learned Counsel for the Respondent submits that the show-cause notice had indicated that if there is any discrepancy in the documents, the same should be pointed out within five days. It is submitted that the petitioner has not pointed out to the Adjudicating Authority any discrepancy in the documents supplied to him.

8. It is further submitted that the proceedings have to be

concluded in a time bound manner.

9. In rejoinder, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not seeking translation of the documents furnished to the petitioner along with the show-cause notice but is only seeking some time to translate the documents filed by the petitioner along with the reply.

10. Perusal of the show cause notice shows that it stipulates that if translated copies in English language are not provided, the documents would not be taken into consideration. If reasonable time were not granted to the petitioner to translate the documents to English, the document in Tamil language would be liable to be ignored, which would prejudice the petitioner. In view thereof, I deem it expedient to grant two weeks time to the petitioner to translate all the documents in Tamil Language, filed along with the reply, that the petitioner is seeking to rely upon into English and submit the same to the Adjudicating Authority.

11. It is clarified that the petitioner would not be permitted by virtue of this order to file any additional reply or documents. The petitioner would be entitled to only file English Translations of the Tamil Documents already filed.

12. The Writ Petition is disposed of in the above terms.

13. It is clarified that this Court has not examined the prayer of the

petitioner relating to the application for lifting of the attachment, which it is stated has not been disposed of by the Adjudicating Authority. The said application is left for the Adjudicating Authority to consider and dispose of in accordance with law.

14. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

APRIL 18, 2017

‘Sn’

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

