

\$~13

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

+ **CRL.A. 25/2020**

UNION OF INDIA

..... Appellant

Through: Mr. Amit Mahajan, CGSC with
Mr. Zoheb Hussain, Mr. Vivek
Gurnani, Mr. Olson Nair &
Ms. Mallika Hiremath, Advocates

Versus

M/S. SKY LIGHT HOSPITALITY LLP

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. A. Fraz Khan, Ms. Ritu Dey,
Ms. Suman Jyoti Khan &
Mr. Shanu Tabrej, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BRIJESH SETHI

ORDER

% **30.01.2020**

Crl.M.A. 569/2020 (delay)

There is delay of 25 days in re-filing the accompanying appeal.

For the reasons stated in the application, it is allowed and the delay is condoned.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.A. 25/2020 & Crl.M.A. 567/2020 (for stay)

The present appeal is filed under Section 142 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 against the impugned order dated 23rd August, 2019 as well as 6th August, 2019 passed by the learned Appellate Tribunal under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 at New Delhi in Appeal No. FPA-PMLA-3178/JP/209.

Learned counsel for appellant has prayed that the impugned orders

dated 23rd August, 26th August, 28th August, 2nd September and 6th September, 2019 passed by the learned Tribunal be set aside in the interest of justice for the reason that the interim order has been passed without giving any reason. He submits that in the present appeal, the relief sought is limited to the extent that the Tribunal be directed to give reasons for passing interim order or to decide the appeal itself.

Mr. A. Fraz Khan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent submits that an application seeking vacation of the interim order and for early hearing of the appeal has been moved by the appellant before the Appellate Tribunal and the grounds urged therein for vacation of interim order are similar as urged in this appeal.

Learned counsel for appellant submits that he is not aware if any such application has been filed by appellant before the Appellate Tribunal and vide this appeal only a direction is sought to be issued to the Appellate Tribunal that if the Tribunal intends to continue the interim order, then reasons ought to be given or in the alternative the appeal be decided at an early date.

Learned counsel for respondent has no objection to it.

Heard.

In view of aforesaid, this Court finds that in the interest of justice, the Appellate Tribunal ought to give reasons for passing interim order if it intends to continue it or may decide the appeal at the earliest.

With above directions, the appeal and application stand disposed of accordingly.

BRIJESH SETHI, J

JANUARY 30, 2020/r