



Cont. P. No.1228 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.08.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

Contempt Petition No.1228 of 2025

AND

Sub Application Nos.523 & 840 to 843 of 2025

Dr.Vandana Parvez

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.Shri Prashant Kumar
The Special Director
Enforcement Directorate
Shastri Bhawan, 3rd Floor, B Wing
No.26, Haddows Road
Chennai 600 006

2.Shri Piyush Kumar Yadav
The Joint Director
Enforcement Directorate
Chennai Zonal Office 1
No.2, 5th & 6th Floor, BSNL Administrative Building
Kushkumar Road, Nungambakkam
Chennai 600 034

3.Shri Sujit Sadhak
The Joint Director
Enforcement Directorate
Chennai Zonal Office 1
No.2, 5th & 6th Floor, BSNL Administrative Building
Kushkumar Road, Nungambakkam
Chennai 600 034

.. Respondents

Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act,



Cont. P. No.1228 of 2025

1971, to punish the respondents for their willful and intentional failure to comply the order of this Court dated 17.10.2024 made in W.P.No.30447 of 2024.

For petitioner : Petitioner-in-person
For respondents : Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan
Additional Solicitor General
Assisted by Mr.P.Sidharthan
Special Public Prosecutor (ED)

ORDER

This Contempt Petition was filed mainly on the ground that the order dated 21.04.2024 passed by this Court in W.P.No.778 of 2024 has not been complied with.

2. When the writ petitions were disposed of, this Court directed the Enforcement Directorate to proceed with the investigation in an effective manner, since the case involved a number of innocent persons who have invested their hard-earned money in the projects. The grievance of the petitioner is that there has been absolutely no progress in the investigation done by the Enforcement Directorate and therefore, the present Contempt Petition came to be filed.



Cont. P. No.1228 of 2025

3. When the matter came up for hearing on 07.07.2025, this Court

WEB ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ passed the following order :

“When the matter was taken up for hearing today, the report of the Assistant Director of the Enforcement Directorate was placed before this Court in a sealed cover. On carefully going through it, it is seen that an ECIR has already been registered in ECIR/30/2020. In the course of the investigation more than 30 bank accounts have been identified, and approximately 60 deeds are also under scrutiny. That apart, the Enforcement Directorate is also in the process of scrutinizing the charge sheet filed before the concerned Court during February 2025, along with the relied-upon documents.

2. The learned Special Government Pleader submitted that the transaction spans from the year 2012 to 2025 and is continuing even thereafter, and it involves voluminous documents to be dealt with. Hence, the learned Special Government Pleader seeks sufficient time to enable the Enforcement Directorate to complete the investigation and to take appropriate action.

3. The petitioner, who appeared in person, submitted that while this investigation is going on, steps are being taken to further precipitate the issue by putting up constructions. Hence, the petitioner moved a petition seeking an interim order.

4. While dealing with the contempt petition, this Court must keep in mind the scope of a contempt petition, and it cannot be dealt with like regular proceedings. Therefore, as and when the petition is numbered and posted for hearing, this Court will deal with the same on its own merits.

5. Post this contempt petition for passing further orders on 04.08.2025 at 2:15 p.m. In the meantime, if the petitioner numbers the sub-application and brings it up for hearing, the same will be dealt with on its own merits.”

4. When the case was taken up for hearing today, the petitioner who appeared in-person relied upon the rejoinder filed for the report given by the



Cont. P. No.1228 of 2025

Enforcement Directorate. The petitioner also relied upon typed set of papers filed in support of the rejoinder.

5. Apart from the above, the petitioner has filed Sub Application Nos.840 to 843 of 2025 seeking for various directions.

6. The learned Additional Solicitor General appearing on behalf of the Enforcement Directorate submitted that the Enforcement Directorate is effectively assessing the materials collected along with the charge sheet that was recently filed in the predicate offence. The learned Additional Solicitor General submitted that some time is required and the Enforcement Directorate cannot mechanically file a complaint or pass an order of attachment under Section 5 of the Prevention of Money-Laundering Act, 2002 (in short "PML Act").

7. The petitioner who appeared in-person submitted that the investigation is pending before the Enforcement Directorate for a very long time and taking advantage of the same, the property which is essentially residential in nature, is now converted as a commercial complex and it is alienated and third party rights are created. As a result, there is an attempt to somehow defeat the interest of many innocent persons who have invested their hard-earned money



Cont. P. No.1228 of 2025

in the projects. The petitioner also brought to the notice of this Court a dossier named as Predators of Public Prosperity running to 65 pages which was handed over to the Enforcement Directorate and submitted that the same has to be considered by the Enforcement Directorate during the course of investigation.

8. In the considered view of this Court, the scope of a contempt petition is very limited. This Court must only see if the order passed by this Court in the writ petition has been violated. This Court is not able to find any contumacious conduct on the part of the respondent warranting exercising contempt jurisdiction. However, considering the grievance expressed by the petitioner, it will be more appropriate to direct the Enforcement Directorate to complete the investigation and to take a decision regarding filing the private complaint and/or proceeding further with the attachment under Section 5 of the PML Act. This process shall be completed within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

9. If, ultimately, there is no progress and the petitioner is aggrieved, it is left open to her to file a fresh writ petition and seek for the appropriate remedy.



Cont. P. No.1228 of 2025

10. With the above observations, this Contempt Petition is closed.

WEB CONNECTED Sub Applications stand closed.

04.08.2025

Index : Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes/No
gya



WEB COPY



Cont. P. No.1228 of 2025

N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.

gya

Cont. Petn. No.1228 of 2025

04.08.2025