



\$~22

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 5473/2025 & CRL.M.As. 23451/2025, 23452/2025**
VIKRAM PRAVIN BHATTPetitioner

Through: Mr. Harpreet Singh, Mr. S. Mathur
and Mr. Jatin Kumar Gaur,
Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for State.
Inspector Satyabir Singh, P.S. EOW.
Mr. Abhishek Gupta, Advocate for R-
5.
Mr. Sanjeev Bindal, Advocate for R-
6.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

% **ORDER**
04.12.2025

1. The present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeks quashing of notice dated 1st July, 2025 issued to the Petitioner by the Economic Offences Wing,¹ New Delhi. By the said notice, the Petitioner has been summoned to join the enquiry pursuant to a complaint lodged by Respondent No. 6, alleging that the Petitioner induced him to invest a sum of INR 18.5 crores with the complainant's company and thereafter cheated him of the said amount.
2. The Petitioner contends that the summons issued by the EOW are without territorial jurisdiction, as the agreements between the parties were



executed in Mumbai and all financial transactions in question also took place within the jurisdiction of Mumbai. It is, therefore, submitted that the EOW, Delhi lacks jurisdiction to initiate the enquiry, rendering the impugned summons liable to be set aside.

3. In response, a status report has been filed by EOW, Delhi to the following effect:

2.1. *The present petition has been filed by Mr. Vikram Pravin Bhatt for quashing of the complaint filed by Mr. Sanjeev Bindal, Authorized Representative for M/s Housefull Motion Picture Pvt. Ltd, at 538, 7th Floor, Tower-3, Mt. Kailash Appts East of Kailash, South Delhi against Mr. Vikram Pravin Bhatt and others.*

2.2. *Mr. Sanjeev Bindal in his aforementioned complaint alleged that the complainant, M/s Housefull Motion Pictures Pvt. Ltd. was engaged in the business of producing, buying, selling, importing, exporting, screening or otherwise dealing in Television programs, films, cinematographic etc. and alleged M/s Loneranger Productions Pvt. Ltd. (now renamed to M/s Hare Krishna Media Tech Pvt. Ltd.) is a production house which is engaged in the business of producing feature, web series, web shows, digital web series and television shows.*

2.3. *It has been alleged that M/s Loneranger Productions Pvt. Ltd. represented to the complainant about the execution of a number of written contracts by the said alleged company with the various OTT platform and TV channels including Netflix, Amazon, Reliance etc. for demo, and is having pre-approved projects in hand which would generate substantial amount of revenue for the alleged.*

2.4. *Believing the warranties, representation and promises of alleged the complainant made investments to the tune of Rs 18 Cr. The development agreement dated 01st August, 2021 and production agreement dated 29th January, 2022 were executive between them. Complaint further alleged that Vikram Pravin Bhatt and Mrs. Krishna Bhatt neither started work on the movies which are annexed to the agreements nor returned the invested amount with the agreed upon profit and cheated to complainant.*

2.5. *An enquiry in this matter revealed that total three (03) agreements dated 1st August, 2021, 31st May, 2021 and 29th January, 2022 respectively were executed between alleged company M/s Loneranger Picture Pvt. Ltd and the complainant House Motion Pictures Pvt. Ltd. in Mumbai.*

¹ “EOW”



2.6. Further, as per respective arbitration clauses of these agreements it was mutually agreed by both the parties that in case of any dispute, difference, proceedings or claim of whatever nature arising out of or in connection with this Agreements, shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with, the laws of India and shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of Mumbai courts only.

2.7. As cause of action arose in Mumbai, Maharashtra and the EOW, New Delhi lacked territorial jurisdiction in this matter, the complaint was forwarded to Mumbai Police, for necessary action at their end.”

4. In light of the fact that EOW, Delhi has now expressly acknowledged its lack of territorial jurisdiction and has already forwarded the complaint to the Mumbai Police for further action, the Petitioner’s challenge to the summons is no longer necessary. The relief sought in the present petition has, therefore, become infructuous.

5. The present petition is accordingly disposed of along with pending applications.

6. The Court has not commented on the merits of the case. All rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

DECEMBER 4, 2025

as