



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

134

CWP-21553-2025(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 30th July, 2025

Sunil Guglani and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

Union of India and others

.... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

* * *

Present : Dr.Rajansh Thukral, Advocate (arguing counsel) with
Dr.Surekha Thukral, Advocate,
Mr.Sidharth Thukral, Advocate and
Mr.Arshnoor Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India with
Ms.Meghna Malik, Senior Panel Counsel for respondents
No.1 and 2 – Enforcement Directorate.

Mr.Gaurav Goel, Advocate and
Ms.Himanshi Garg, Advocate for
respondents No.3 and 4.

* * *

SHEEL NAGU, CJ. (Oral)

1. Challenge in this petition, filed under Articles 226/227 is to
summons dated 21.07.2025 (Annexure P-1 *colly.*), issued under Section



50 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA for brevity), by which the petitioners have been summoned in the office of respondent No.2 in person to give evidence and to produce records as per the schedule mentioned therein, in connection with Enforcement Case Information Report (ECIR) No.CDZO-I/08/2021 dated 07.10.2021 registered against M/s Super Multicolor Printer Private Limited and others and ECIR No.CDZO-I/14/2023 dated 14.09.2023 against M/s Dunn Food Pvt. Ltd and others.

2. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioners is that they apprehend coercive steps may be taken if they attend the office of respondent No.2 in response to the impugned summons, especially when the documents sought are not in the possession of petitioners.

3. A bare perusal of Section 50 of PMLA reveals that the Enforcement Directorate is empowered to summon, any person whose attendance it considers necessary, to attend its office in person or through authorized agents and when such person appears, the said person shall be bound to state the truth upon any subject respecting which they are examined or make statements, and produce such documents as may be required.

4. We do not see any basis for the apprehension nursed by the petitioners since every citizen of this Country is bound to assist the Investigating Agencies by cooperating in any investigation or inquiry against any third person or agency.



5. As regards the contention that the petitioners do not have any document, the petitioners can always file affidavit in this regard before the functionaries of the Enforcement Directorate.
6. We do not find any ground to interfere in the petition, which stands disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

30th July, 2025
‘gian’

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>