

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.28842 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 05.03.2020

Genex Infratech Ltd.

..... Petitioner

versus

Union of India & ors.

..... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

Present :- Mr. Sandeep Wadhawan, Advocate
for the petitioner (CWP-28842 & 119860-2017).

Mr. Rahul Bhargawa, Advocate
for the petitioner (CWP-7718-2019).

Mr. Vikram Chaudhri, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Rahil Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner (CWP-6187 & 6195-2020).

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General
of India with Mr. Sanjay Vashisth, Sr. Panel Counsel with
Mr. Alok Kumar Jain, Advocate
for the respondents-UOI.
(CWP-12371 & 14270-2017).

Mr. Vikra Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner (CWP-2360-2019).

Ms. Ridhi Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. R.Kartikeya, Advocate
(CWP-12371-2017 & CWP-14270-2017)

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General with
Mr. Arvind Moudgil, Sr. Panel Counsel and
Mr. Dheeraj Jain, Advocate
for respondents-UOI.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of sixteen writ petitions bearing

***CWP Nos.28842-2017, 19860-2017, 12371-2017, 14270-2017, 364-
2019, 1463-2019, 2347-2019, 2348-2019, 2360-2019, 2945-2019, 6349-
2019, 7718-2019, 8937-2019, 11052-2019, 6187-2020 and 6195-2020.***

Since common questions of law and facts are involved therein, they are being decided by this common order.

In this group of petitions various provisions of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (for short the Act) have been assailed. The common ground before us is that many similar petitions have been filed in the Supreme Court where cumulatively there is an even more broad based challenge to not only the provisions challenged before us but other provisions of the Act also.

Once that is so, we do not deem it appropriate to have a tunnel vision interpretation of the individual provisions before us, more so and since the Supreme Court would be looking at the larger aspect and opining on the provisions of the Act in a more holistic manner. Despite the fact that the counsel for the petitioners are urging otherwise, we deem it appropriate to permit all the petitions to be withdrawn with liberty to take appropriate challenge before the Supreme Court of India.

The aforesaid petitions stand dismissed as withdrawn with liberty aforesaid.

Since the main cases have been decided, the pending Applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

05.03.2020

pooja sharma-I

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No