IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved On: 25.07.2024	Pronounced On: 02.08.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN

W.P.No.13793 of 2024
& W.P.Nos.14958, 14960, 15183 and 23000 of 2024

S.P.Velayutham. .... Petitioner/Accused

/versus/

1.State by
Station House Officer,
Inspector of Police, Section V,
Economic Offences Wing,
Mandir Marg.,
New Delhi – 110 001
Crime No.210 of 2020.

2. M/s.Emaar MGF Land Ltd,
Rep. by its Authorised Signatory,
Nikhil Srivastawa (9560396262),
C2, District Center, Saket,
New Delhi – 110 017. ... Respondent/Complainant

Prayer: Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the entire records relating to the impugned FIR in Crime No.210 of 2020 pending investigation on the file of 1st respondent Inspector of Police, EOW, New Delhi and quash the same as without jurisdiction, vitiated by Legal Malafides and abuse of process of law or in alternative direct the 1st respondent to transfer the Investigation being conducted by the Economic Offences Wing, New Delhi to the Economic

Offences Wing, Tambaram Commissionerate or any other investigating agency of the Chennai Police.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.N.R.Elango, Senior Counsel for Mr.S.Xavier Felix
For R1	:	No appearance
For R2	:	Mr.T.Gowthaman, Senior Counsel, for M/s.KNS Law Chambers.

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the entire records relating to the impugned FIR in Crime No.210 of 2020 pending investigation on the file of 1st respondent/Inspector of Police, EOW, New Delhi and quash the same as without jurisdiction, vitiated by Legal Malafides and abuse of process of law or in alternative, direct the 1st respondent to transfer the Investigation being conducted by the Economic Offences Wing, New Delhi to the Economic Offences Wing, Tambaram Commissionerate or any other Investigating Agency of the Chennai Police.

2. The above said Writ Petition to quash the F.I.R in Crime No.210/2020 on the file of Inspector of Police, Section V, Economic Offences Wing been registered as per the direction of the Learned Chief Metropolitan

Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi in exercise of its power under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C.

3. The substantial grounds raised in this quash petition are:-

i) Suppressing the fact that Civil Suit in C.S.No.169/2018 pending on the file of the Original Side of the Hon’ble High Court, Madras regarding the same transaction in respect of immovable properties at Chennai, the complaint before the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate at Delhi given by abusing the process of law.

ii) The earlier criminal complaints to the police regarding the same transaction been enquired and action dropped as civil dispute. Despite that, the Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi without following the dictum laid in Priyanka Srivatsava case, [2015(6)SCC 287] had entertained the complaint petition filed 14 years after the occurrence alleging cheating, misrepresentation, breach of trust and conspiracy.

iii) The entire transaction between the parties took place in Chennai. The property which is the subject matter of the complaint is within the jurisdiction of Chennai. While so, making a vague averment that the negotiation took place in Delhi and payments were made at Delhi, the complainant had chosen forum at Delhi to agitate his criminal complaint after filing the suit in Madras High Court for the same transaction stating the cause of the action for the suit for recovery of money is within the territorial jurisdiction of Madras High Court. Had the complainant fairly disclosed in his complaint that the complainant company had initiated Civil Suit for recovery of money against this petitioner, the Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi would not have entertained the complaint and issued direction to register the complaint.

4. The Registry of this Court, had doubt whether Writ Petition to quash a criminal complaint under investigation by Delhi Police based on the judicial order passed by Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi could be entertained. Therefore, the matter was listed under caption “For Maintainability” before the Learned Judge for appropriate order.

5. After considering the facts of the case and the judgments of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in i) ***Oil and Natural Gas Commission -vs- Utpal Kumar Basu and others*** reported in ***1994(4) SCC 711*** and ii) ***Navinchandra N.Majithia -vs- State of Maharashtra and others*** reported in ***2000 (7) SCC***

640 this Court held that, the Writ Petition is maintainable and directed the Registry to list the case for hearing after numbering it. Accordingly, when the matter came up for admission on 24/05/2024, this Court being *prima faciely* satisfied that the complaint at Delhi is without jurisdiction granted interim stay for two weeks and ordered notice for hearing the 2nd respondents.

6. After notice, the defacto complainant had entered appearance through his Counsel. Also a preliminary counter filed on behalf of the defacto complainant/2nd respondent. That apart, on behalf of the 2nd respondent oral submissions made by Mr.T.Gowthaman, Senior Counsel on why this writ petition has to be dismissed.

7. In the preliminary counter affidavit filed by the 2nd respondent it is stated that, to quash a criminal complaint, Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution is not maintainable in view of the following judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in :-

1). ***Gaythri Prasad Prajapati -vs- State of Uttar Pradesh*** judgment dated 21/02/2022.

2) ***State of H.P -vs- Pirithi Chand and another*** reported in ***1996(2) SCC 37.***

3) ***State of Haryana & others –vs- Bajanlal and others*** reported in ***1992 Supp (1) SCC 335***.

8. According to the Learned Senior Counsel for the defacto complainant, the case was registered by Delhi Economic Offence Wings on the direction of the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi. Hence, any petition to quash the complaint ought to have been filed only before the Court at Delhi. Further, to quash a criminal complaint pending investigation, petition ought to have been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C and not a Writ Petition under Article 226 of Constitution of India which can be invoked only in case of violation of Fundamental Right. In order to circumvent the legal procedure, the petitioner has filed Writ Petition under Article 226 of Constitution of India before this Court which has no supervisory jurisdiction over the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi who has ordered investigation by exercising its power under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C.

9. Similarly, the main prayer to quash the complaint in Crime No.210 of 2020 and the alternate prayer to transfer the investigation from Economic Offence Wing, Delhi to Economic Offence Wing, Tambaram, Tamil Nadu is not clear and ambiguous. It is a frivolous petition which deserve to be dismissed at the threshold following the dictum laid in ***Baikunth Prasad Verma*** -vs- ***Lachmi Paper House & Others*** reported in ***1991(2) PLJR 478*** dated 20/11/1989.

10. The petitioner has filed a rejoinder to the above preliminary counter to justify how the Writ Petition is maintainable to quash a criminal case under investigation by Delhi Police before this Court at Chennai. According to the petitioner, the issue regarding maintainability of this Writ Petition already been considered and detailed order was passed on 09/05/2024 holding the Writ Petition is maintainable after considering the dictum laid in ONGC -vs- Utpal Kumar Base case (cited supra) and Navinchandra N.Majithia case (cited supra). Therefore, as far the facts of this case, the question of maintainability is no more *res integra.*

Points for consideration:-

1) Whether the petitioner had ventured in Forum Shopping by filing Writ Petition before this Court to quash the criminal case under investigation by Economic Offence Wing, New Delhi registered as per the direction of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi in exercise of its power under 156(3) of Cr.P.C.?

2) If no, whether the facts of the case warrants interference of this Court in the on going investigation and quash it as frivolous and vexatious complaint and bereft of prima facie material to infer commission of cognizable crime?

3) Whether pendency of a civil suit for recovery of money will be a legal impediment for the police to register and investigate this case?

11. The substance of the complaint dated 27/11/2019 filed under Section 200 Cr.P.C before Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi is that, the complainant Company having registered Office at New Delhi is a leading construction Company. During the month of November 2006, the petitioner (S.P.Velayutham – A1) approached the complainant Company at Delhi and represented that, he can arrange for purchase of 8.24 acres of land in Alandur Village near Chennai and induced to enter into an agreement to purchase the said land with one K.S.Deenadayalu and Amar S/o.Velayutham, both introduced by the petitioner as owner of the said land and the petitioner as their Power of Attorney holder entered into sale agreement dated 23/08/2006 with those owners. Believing the representation of the petitioner and the above two persons, the complainant Company entered into deed of assignment on 15/12/2006 in respect of 8.24 acres of land in Alandur for a sale consideration of Rs.1,64,52,70,000/-.

12. Pursuant to the agreement, Rs.5 crores was paid on 15/12/2006 by way of two cheques. As per the terms of the agreement, on the date of registration of the sale deed, the Complainant has to pay Rs.50 lakhs and the balance Rs.1,14,52,70,000/- to be paid after completion of all the undertaking and promises specifically mentioned in Clause 2 of the deed of assignment dated 15/12/2006.

13. On 15/12/2006, for providing service to clear the encumbrance, the petitioner and his son Amar received Rs.1,01,00,000/-. Later, to pay the owners of the land (petitioner herein) received Rs.10 crores on 23/01/2007. This money were not paid to the owners but retained by the petitioner himself. Again during the month of February 2007 demanded Rs.35 crores to pay the encroachers and to pay the Indian Bank to get the possession from the encroachers. A escrow agreement was entered between the parties appointing one Shri Kaushik N.Sharma as escrow Agent and demand draft for Rs.35 crores paid into the escrow account. The petitioner, later took away the entire original title deeds from the Escrow Agent under the pretext of settling the dues with Indian Bank.

14. In the month of March/April 2007, the petitioner demanded money to settle the balance payable to Indian Bank and induced the complainant to deliver Rs.10 crores on 27/04/2007. Later, it came to the knowledge of the complainant that nothing was paid to Indian Bank and there was no lien of the property with the Indian Bank. Thus, by fraudulent representation and with intention of cheating, the petitioner and others had induced the complainant Company to pay Rs.51 crores.

15. Subsequently, representing that the actual extent of land in Alandur as per revenue records is about 20 acres and showing certain forged document, made the complainant to believe that he will arrange to transfer the entire 20 acres of land to the complainant Company and for which initially the property has to be transferred from the owners to his son Amar. So that the larger extent of land can be transferred to the complainant through his son Amar. Believing the words of the petitioner, the Company entered into an Addendum to the deed of Assignment and was induced to pay on 03/07/2007 an additional sum of Rs.12,61,77,638/- (Rupees Twelve Crores Sixty One Lakhs Seventy Seven Thousand Six Hundred and Thirty Eight) towards conveyance cost and Rs.1,57,72,205/- (Rupees One Crore Fifty Seven Lakhs

Seventy Two Thousand Two Hundred and Five) towards stamp duty expenses. After receiving this money the next day, the petitioner as Power of Attorney holder of the land owners, transferred the Alandur property to his Son Amar.

16. During the course of negotiating the additional land in Alandur, the petitioner also came up with a new proposal to sell the land owned by M/s.Raptakos Brett Company at Velacherry, Chennai and claiming as the agreement holder for the said land the petitioner induced the complainant to join him in the joint venture to promote the land and made him to part away Rs.100 crores on 31/08/2007 as interest free adjustable deposit to get 16.52 acres out of 22.24 acres registered in the name of the complainant within 30 days from the payment. Later, the complainant came to know that the petitioner has forged the signature of the Managing Director, M/s.Raptakos Brett Company and deceived the complainant to part away Rs.100 crores.

17. The Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi after considering the allegations made in the complaint and on perusing the Action Taken Report filed by the Investigating Officer who had submitted that the dispute is civil in nature, directed to register the complaint of cheating Rs.1,84,00,000/- (Rupees One Crore Eighty Four Lakhs only) pursuant to conspiracy hatched by the petitioner, his son Amar, K.S.Deenadayalu Reddy, Venkatakrishnan and Ramanathan. The Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, after discussing the averments found in the complaint and relying upon the dictum laid in *Lalitha Kumar's* case had concluded that,

> *"the fact of the matter is that the complaint exfacie discloses commission of several cognizable offences as a bare reading of it would reveal that allegation of forgery, diversion of funds and inducement through agreements one after another which led to complainant for parting with his money exist. The allegation requires police investigation as evidence is required to be collected for ascertainment of truth. Accordingly, this court is of considered view that on the basis of complaint FIR is required to be registered against the accused persons."*

18. After registration of the complaint in Crime No.210/2020, the Investigating Officer had issued summon under Section 91 of Cr.P.C., to the petitioner and the petitioner had appeared before the Investigating Officer and given his statement. Again, a notice under Section 41-A of Cr.P.C., dated 24/02/2023 issued for appearance before the Investigating Officer on 10/03/2021. The petitioner and his son who apprehends arrest by the first respondent police in connection with this case has obtained anticipatory bail from this Court in Crl.O.P.No.10321/2024 dated 30/04/2024 on condition that they should appear before the first respondent police every Saturday at 10.30 a.m until 05/07/2024. Meanwhile, this Writ Petition is filed to quash the complaint.

19. On behalf of the petitioner regarding maintainability, pointing that except claiming that the negotiation took place in Delhi and some of the payments were made in Delhi, all transaction necessary for investigation had taken place only in Chennai. In paragraph No.42 of the complaint, the Court been mislead by the statement of the complaint that the Court has jurisdiction to try the present case as the offences have been committed by the accused persons within the jurisdiction of Economic Offences Wing, Mandir Marg Police Station. Whereas, in the suit C.S.No.169/2018 filed for recovery of Rs.1,84,07,27,698/ with interest, it is stated that part cause of action arose at T.Nagar, Chennai where the defendants office situated, meetings and negotiations took place.

20. The Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submitted that, when the complainant in the suit had admitted that part cause of action arose at Chennai, then as per the dictum laid in *Navinchandra N.Majithia* case, the writ petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution before the High Court of Madras is maintainable. Further, after the Court has passed a judicial order regarding maintainability, there is no necessary to reopen the issue.

21. Contrarily, the Learned Senior Counsel for the respondent submit that even if the Court has initially satisfied on *prima facie* material that Writ Petition is maintainable and issued rule nisi, it can be dismissed subsequently, on the ground of alternate remedy. To buttress this preposition, he rely upon the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***2008 (12) SCC 675*** *in re:* ***State of Uttar Pradesh*** and ***another -vs- Uttar Pradesh Rajya Khanij Vikas Nigam Sangharsh Samiti and others***.

22. To buttress his submission that quash of F.I.R on ground of lack of territorial jurisdiction of police to investigate the offence is improper, he relied on ***Satvinder Kaur -vs- State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) and another*** reported in ***1999 (8) SCC 728***.

23. In ***ONGC -vs- Utpal Kumar Basu*** *(cited supra)* case, the Supreme Court while considering cause of action and territorial jurisdiction in a matter arising from a tender setting up of Kerosene Recovery Processing Unit, considering Section 21 of C.P.C, Articles 136 and 226(2) of the Constitution, the Three Judges Bench of the Supreme Court has held that, tender called from Delhi for work to be carried out at Gujarat, offer by the Writ Petition from Calcutta will not confer jurisdiction to Calcutta High Court to entertain writ petition challenging the non consideration of his offer on the premise that part cause of action arose within the territorial jurisdiction of Calcutta.

24. In ***Navinchandra N.Majithia*** case *(cited supra)*, the writ petition filed in Bombay High Court to quash the criminal complaint registered at Shillong was entertained. The Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasising that Article 226(2) of the Constitution, enables a person to invoke the writ jurisdiction of the Court where part cause of action arise, even though the seat of authority or residence of the person against whom the direction, order or writ is sought to be issued is not within the said territory.

25. Therefore, this Court on considering the facts disclosed by the respective parties, conclude that the dispute between the parties is in respect of land situated within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court. The allegation of fraud, breach of trust and cheating has to be necessarily probed where the land situated and revenue records maintained. Therefore, hold that the Writ Petition is maintainable in this Court, which has territorial jurisdiction over the land involved in the transaction.

26. By filing the Writ Petition in Madras High Court, it cannot be inferred that the petitioner had ventured in Forum Shopping. When a litigant has option to choose a forum, he had chosen forum of his convenience. Accordingly, the first point for consideration is answered in negative.

27. Going on to the merits of the case, in view of this Court, the impugned complaint cannot be quashed for want of jurisdiction or for the reason that the complainant had initiated suit for recovery of money against the accused/petitioner.

28. In ***Satvinder Kaur -vs- State (Govt. Of NCT of Delhi) and another*** reported in ***1999(8) SCC 728***, on considering the relevant provisions of law under Chapter XIII of the Code of Criminal Procedure, (Sections 177 to 188) relates to "jurisdiction of the criminal courts in enquires and trials" had observed as below:-

> ***14.*** *Further, the legal position is well settled that if an offence is disclosed the court will not normally interfere with an investigation into the case and will*

permit investigation into the offence alleged to be completed. If the FIR, prima facie, discloses the commission of an offence, the court does not normally stop the investigation, for, to do so would be to trench upon the lawful power of the police to investigate into cognizable offences. It is also settled by a long course of decisions of this Court that for the purpose of exercising its power under Section 482 CrPC to quash an FIR or a complaint, the High Court would have to proceed entirely on the basis of the allegations made in the complaint or the documents accompanying the same per se; it has no jurisdiction to examine the correctness or otherwise of the allegations.

29. In the case in hand, the complainant Company had disclosed the closure of his earlier complaints to the Delhi Police and how transaction in this case arose within the territorial jurisdiction of Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi. In ***Satvinder Kaur*** case (cited supra) the Hon'ble Supreme Court had clarified the issue in the following words:-

"***8.*** *In our view, the submission made by the learned counsel for the appellant requires to be accepted. The limited question is whether the High Court was justified in quashing the FIR on the ground that Delhi Police Station did not have territorial jurisdiction to investigate the offence. From the discussion made by the learned Judge, it* *appears that learned Judge has considered the provisions applicable for criminal trial. The High Court arrived at the conclusion by appreciating the allegations made by the parties that the SHO, Police Station Paschim Vihar, New Delhi was not having territorial jurisdiction to entertain and investigate the FIR lodged by the appellant because the alleged dowry items were entrusted to the respondent at Patiala and that the alleged cause of action for the offence punishable under Section 498-A IPC arose at Patiala. In our view, the findings given by the High Court are, on the face of it, illegal and erroneous because:*

(1) The SHO has statutory authority under Section 156 of the Criminal Procedure Code to investigate any cognizable case for which an FIR is lodged.

(2) At the stage of investigation, there is no question of interference under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code on the ground that the investigating officer has no territorial jurisdiction.

(3) After investigation is over, if the investigating officer arrives at the conclusion that the cause of action for lodging the FIR has not arisen within his territorial jurisdiction, then he is required to submit a report accordingly under Section 170 of the Criminal Procedure Code and to forward the case to the Magistrate empowered to take cognizance of the offence."

30. In the instant case, the Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi had applied its mind and held that it is a case for investigation and had directed the first respondent to register the case and investigate. Pursuant to the direction, the first respondent had commenced investigation. At the stage of investigation, on the ground that the Investigating Officer has no territorial jurisdiction, Court need not interfere when particularly the direction been issued by a Judicial Officer, who is not under the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court. Further, the Station House Officer has a statutory duty to register the complaint and investigate since it is a judicial order passed by the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. After investigation, if the Investigating Officer arrives at the conclusion that there is no territorial jurisdiction for the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi to try the offence, the Investigating Officer can forward his report to the Magistrate, who is empowered to take cognizance under Section 170 Cr.P.C to take further action.

31. This Court finds disclosure of several incidents of deceit and inducement in the complaint. The Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, had found that these facts warrants investigation. Therefore, even assuming the Learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate had not obtained affidavit from the complainant as per the direction by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Priyanka Srivatsava* case, interference of this Court in the on going investigation is not warranted. It is not a case of pure civil in nature given a cloak of criminal offence. Even in the plaint filed for recovery of money, the complainant had stated that the 2nd respondent (the petitioner herein) had hatched a devious ploy at the very initial stage to cheat and defraud and extort huge sums of money under the guise of sale of property which the 2nd respondent (petitioner herein) had no right or title over. Hence, this Court holds that the complaint on the face of it is not a frivolous or vexatious complaint. It discloses *prima facie* material to investigate commission of cognizable crime.

The last issue for consideration, is whether pendency of a civil suit for recovery of money will be a legal impediment for the police to register and investigate this case?

32. The pendency of civil suit or complaint disclosing a civil transaction is not a bar for initiating criminal prosecution, if essential ingredients for commission of cognizable offence is made out in the complaint. Many times, a civil dispute may later turn into a criminal case when the parties take law into their hands or under the garb of civil transaction one may commit offence of forgery, fraud, criminal breach of trust or cheating. It is for the Court to cautiously scrutinise the facts of each case and find out whether a complaint discloses a criminal offence or not. A complaint disclosing civil transactions may also have a criminal texture. Whether essential ingredients of criminal offence are present or not has to be Judged by the High Court.

33. In ***Salib -vs- State of U.P and others*** reported in ***MANU/SC/0851/2023***, at paragraph 26, it is held that,

> "*26. At this stage, we would like to observe something important. Whenever an Accused comes before the Court invoking either the inherent powers Under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) or extraordinary jurisdiction Under Article 226 of the Constitution to get the FIR or the criminal proceedings quashed essentially on the ground that such proceedings are manifestly frivolous or vexatious or instituted with the ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance, then in such circumstances the Court owes a duty to look into the FIR with care and a little more closely. We say so because once the complainant decides to proceed against the Accused with an ulterior motive for wreaking personal vengeance, etc., then he would ensure that the FIR/complaint is very well drafted with all the necessary pleadings. The complainant would ensure that the averments made in the FIR/complaint are such that they disclose the necessary ingredients to constitute the alleged offence. Therefore, it will not be just enough for the Court to look into the averments made in the FIR/complaint*

alone for the purpose of ascertaining whether the necessary ingredients to constitute the alleged offence are disclosed or not. In frivolous or vexatious proceedings, the Court owes a duty to look into many other attending circumstances emerging from the record of the case over and above the averments and, if need be, with due care and circumspection try to read in between the lines. The Court while exercising its jurisdiction Under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure or Article 226 of the Constitution need not restrict itself only to the stage of a case but is empowered to take into account the overall circumstances leading to the initiation/registration of the case as well as the materials collected in the course of investigation. Take for instance the case on hand. Multiple FIRs have been registered over a period of time. It is in the background of such circumstances the registration of multiple FIRs assumes importance, thereby attracting the issue of wreaking vengeance out of private or personal grudge as alleged."

34. In the instant case, no doubt the complainant Company had approached the local police and the complaint came to be closed as civil dispute. Following the dictum laid in ***Latitha Kumari -vs- State of Uttar Pradesh*** case, the complainant had approached the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate and had disclosed the facts about the earlier complaints and its closure. Therefore, this Court finds no suppression of fact or Forum Shopping as alleged by the petitioner. On various occasion, money from the complainant been received by the petitioner promising one or other offer and all those offers were alleged to be an inducement to extract money and cheat. The facts narrated in the complaint are not denied as false. They are not new found facts but already form part of the plaint instituted in the year 2018.

35. The criminal complaint can only lead to punishment of the perpetrator of the crime if the guilt is proved. The person who lost the money due to the dubious design of fraud, has to necessarily go for recovery of money and for which, money suit is the only remedy. For recovery of money, suit has to be initiated within the limitation period prescribed under law. The complainant in this case had resorted to civil remedy for recovery of money and initiated the complaint to punish the offenders for the commission of cognizable offences.

36. From the materials placed, this Court is of the view that it is a case for investigation since the complaint discloses each and every time when and where the complainant has paid money on the promise or representation of the petitioner to do part of his contract but later found they all were false promise or fraudulent representation. Particularly, the receipt of about Rs.13

crores offering additional extent of land at Alandur by showing fake revenue records and the offer of Velecherry land for joint venture proposal without any right to receive Rs.100 crores are matters which requires investigation.

37. On considering the facts of the case, the petition to quash or the alternate relief to order transfer of investigation deserve to be dismissed. Accordingly, this ***Writ Petition No.13793 of 2024 stands dismissed***. This dismissal of the quash petition shall not prejudice the petitioner, to challenge the final report, on completion of investigation. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

02.08.2024

Index :Yes.
Internet :Yes.
bsm
To:-
1. The Station House Officer, Inspector of Police, Section V,
Economic Offences Wing, Mandir Marg.,
New Delhi – 110 001.

Dr.G.JAYACHANDRAN, J.

bsm

Pre-delivery order made in
W.P.No.13793 of 2024

02.08.2024