

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner drew my attention to the evidence of CW-1 Ms. Anamika Ahir, Manager SEBI wherein in paragraph 7 she has stated that “There is an office copy of Exhibits 60, 62 and 64”. The learned counsel submitted that this shows that the office copies of these documents are available.

4. Learned SPP appearing for SEBI submitted that these documents are photocopies, i.e., record of SEBI, as originals are the adjudication orders and they were served on the accused, therefore, the original documents are in the custody of accused. The learned counsel submitted that the office copies of Exhibits 60, 62 and 64 are available with SEBI and so they will produce the same. He submitted that the office copies are available with SEBI but they do not show any acknowledgment as the notices are served on the petitioner/accused by RPAD and RPAD acknowledgments are produced before the Court.

5. In view of this, the trial Court to verify whether the original acknowledgements of the RPAD are produced or not and if the originals are produced, then the photocopies of exhibits 60, 62 and

64 will remain by way of secondary evidence.

6. Writ Petition is disposed of.

(MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)