

\$~9

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

+ W.P.(C) 9726/2016 & CM No. 38887/2016

NEELIMA CHATURVEDI Petitioner

Through: Mr Shailesh Pandey, Advocate.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT (PMLA) Respondent

Through: Mr Amit Mahajan, CGC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

15.11.2018

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the proceedings initiated by the respondent under the provisions of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA). One of the principal grounds urged by the petitioner is that the scheduled offence on which the said proceedings are premised was allegedly committed much prior to the PMLA coming into force. The petitioner further states that no offence of money laundering has been committed after the PMLA was enacted.
2. Mr Mahajan, learned counsel appearing for the respondent disputes the aforesaid contentions. He states that even though the scheduled offence may have been committed prior to PMLA being enacted, the proceeds of crime have been laundered even after the PMLA has come into force. He further states that the petitioner had also preferred an appeal against the order of the Adjudicating Authority.
3. Since, the petitioner has availed of the alternate remedy, this Court

does not consider it apposite to entertain this petition at this stage. However, the Appellate Tribunal is requested to consider the petitioner's appeal as expeditiously as possible.

4. The petition is disposed of. The pending application is also disposed of.

5. It is clarified that nothing stated herein should be construed as an expression opinion on the merits of the controversy. All contentions of the parties are reserved.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

NOVEMBER 15, 2018

MK