

2025 PHHC: 164247



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

COCP-1862-2024 (O&M)

Reserved on: 30.09.2025

Pronounced on: 27.11.2025

Uploaded on: 27.11.2025

SMERITY RANI

...Petitioner

Versus

S. RAVICHANDRAN, SPECIAL DIRECTOR & ANR.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Pardeep Solath, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Special counsel (through VC),
Mr. Shobit Phutela, Advocate,
Mr. Lokesh Narang, Advocate, and
Mr. Kartik Sabherwal, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

Ms. Puneeta Sethi, Sr. Panel Counsel, and
Mr. Y.S. Thakur, Advocate,
for respondent No.2-SFIO.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J.

The instant petition has been preferred under Section 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1971 Act') alleging willful disobedience of judgment/order dated 02.09.2022 (Annexure P-1), passed by a Division Bench of this Court in CWP-PIL-81-2022.

2. CWP-PIL-81-2022 had been instituted by one Sh. Deepak Jain. By way of the said petition, the petitioner therein prayed for initiation of action against respondent No.8 therein (IREO Private

Limited) and to recover amount running into thousands of crores of rupees that had illegally been laundered and taken out of the country and further to conduct an investigation/inquiry into the illegalities committed and, thereafter, to proceed against the said respondent.

3. The writ petition was disposed of by a Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 02.09.2022, on the basis of a statement having been given by learned Additional Solicitor General of India.

The operative part of the said order reads as under:-

“Learned Additional Solicitor General of India, appearing on advance copy, submits that respondents No.4 and 6 are already investigating the matter and the allegation relating to the affairs of as many as 20 companies, including respondent No.8 is also under investigation. He further submits that, in case, the petitioner wishes to provide any information in respect of these companies, including respondent No.8 and other such companies, he can do so by approaching the respondents-authorities or respondents No.4 and 6, which are investigating the matter.

In view of the fact that the respondent-authorities are already investigating the matter and would subsequently take action, if required, against respondent No.8 and other such companies, in accordance with law, we find no reason to entertain the present petition and the same is accordingly disposed of by taking the statement of the learned Additional Solicitor General of India on record, which forms part of the order.

The petitioner would be at liberty to appear before respondents No.4 and 6 and submit all necessary information(s)/document(s), which are material for investigation.”

4. The petitioner herein claims to have entered into an agreement to sell along with one Sh. Ranjeet Kumar Tiwary with Sh. Deepak Jain for the sale of apartment No. CD-A3-04-401 situated at

IREO, The Corridors Projects, Gurugram, on 05.12.2023. It is the case of the petitioner that on the basis of the aforesaid agreement to sell, Sh. Deepak Jain continued to have 10% rights in the flat and 90% rights were transferred in favour of the petitioner and Sh. Ranjeet Kumar Tiwary.

5. It has further been averred that the said Sh. Deepak Jain had filed COCP-331-2024 against the respondents, alleging that they had been sleeping over the matter and no concrete action had been taken against the kingpin of the fraud namely Sh. Lalit Goyal. It is the case of the petitioner that Sh. Deepak Jain had entered into a secret arrangement with IREO Company and pursuant to the same, he withdrew COCP-331-2024 and another COCP-847-2024, which he had jointly filed with the present petitioner.

6. Many other details with regard to the IREO group and *inter-se* issues between the petitioner and Sh. Deepak Jain, have been given in the contempt petition, which are not relevant for the purpose of its decision.

7. The basic case set up in the contempt petition is that despite directions having been issued in CWP-PIL-81-2022, no concrete action has been taken and after the arrest of Sh. Lalit Goyal and interim bail granted to him, the said Sh. Lalit Goyal has been disposing of various properties. It is the case of the petitioner that the directions issued in CWP-PIL-81-2022 have not been complied with, leading to the filing of the present petition.

8. The respondents (Enforcement Directorate and Serious Fraud Investigation Office) have filed separate replies/status reports.

9. In the reply filed by respondent No.1, the details of action initiated against IREO and other Companies have been given, whereas in the status report submitted by respondent No.2, details of the illegalities committed by the IREO Group of Companies and the action initiated thereupon, have also been given. It has been averred that a total number of 70 notices and 107 summons have been issued till date by the investigation unit. It has also been averred that the investigation covers around 200 Companies involving around 225 Directors, 400 Bank Accounts and many other issues. It has further been averred that the data analyzed or yet to be analyzed is voluminous in nature and time consuming, but still progress is being made on a daily basis.

10. Learned counsel for the parties were heard.

11. It was strenuously urged by learned counsel for the petitioner that by not properly investigating the matter, the respondents have committed willful disobedience of the directions passed by the Division Bench. Insofar as the *locus standi* of the petitioner is concerned, it was submitted that since the writ petition had been filed in public interest, any person from the public can file a contempt petition.

12. Learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, submitted that the contempt petition is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed.

13. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

14. Concededly, the writ petition had been disposed of by the Division Bench of this Court upon a statement having been given by learned Additional Solicitor General of India and the petitioner therein had also been granted liberty to appear before the Enforcement Directorate and Serious Fraud Investigation Office.

15. Insofar as the *locus standi* of the petitioner is concerned, this Court is not inclined to examine the issue in detail, for, concededly, the writ petition filed was a petition in public interest and had been disposed of on a statement having been given by learned Additional Solicitor General of India that the matter was being investigated. This Court is, therefore, inclined to entertain the instant petition.

16. Coming to the merits, it is well settled that there should normally be no interference at the stage of investigation. Both agencies have, in their, status report given details of the investigation being carried out. Nothing has come on record which could have suggested any laxity on the part of the respondents. Further, there is absolutely no material on record to even suggest any disobedience, much less willful disobedience of the directions issued by the Division Bench.

17. In the considered opinion of this Court, the contempt petition is totally misconceived and appears to have been filed with some oblique motive.

18. Without commenting any further, this Court finds the instant contempt petition to be bereft of merit and the same is accordingly dismissed.

19. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

27.11.2025
Himanshu

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No