CGHC010391442026 2026:CGHC:43357-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPCR No. 574 of 2026

1. Rekha Neware W/o Sh. Ramdayal Neware Aged About 48 Years R/o Ward No. 10, Gram Tirodi V T C, Kharpadiya, P.O. Tirodi Sub Distt- Katangi, Distt- Balaghat, Madhya Pradesh – 481449
2. Nilesh Keshorao Gajbhiye S/o Sh. Keshorao Gajbhiye Aged About 41 Years R/o New Shastri Ward Near Yashoda Sabhgruh, V T C Gondiya, P.O. Gondia Sub Distt- Gondiya, Distt- Gondiya Maharashtra – 441601
3. Panchu Lal Pandhre S/o Sh. Moti Ram Pandhre Aged About 39 Years R/o Village Jamdi Police Station Kasauli Distt- Gondiya Maharashtra -
4. Buddhadas Premdas Ramtake S/o Sh. Premdas Ramtake Aged About 46 Years R/o Dhwani Apartment Sister Colony Naginabag, Chandrapur, Distt- Chandrapur, Maharashtra -

...

Petitioner(s)

versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs Govt. Of Chhattisgarh Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Distt- Raipur (C.G.)
2. Director General Of Police, State Of Chhattisgarh, Police Headquarter Nava Raipur, Distt- Raipur (C.G.)
3. Superintendent Of Police, Distt- Rajnandgaon (C.G.)
4. Kamlesh Verma S/o Paltan Ram Verma R/o House No. 2, Ridhi Siddhi Colony, Dongargaon Road Phase - 1 Ward No. 45, Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

SANTOSH KUMAR SHARMA
Digitally signed by SANTOSH KUMAR SHARMA
Date: 2026.10.08 00:15:28 +0530

5. Udaksha Kumar Verma S/o Bhaiya Ji Verma R/o Qr. Near Hanuman Mandir Ward No. Jiratola, Rajnandgaon (C.G.) Presently At House No. 2, Ridhi Siddhi Colony, Dongargaon Road Phase - 1 Ward No. 45, Rajnandgaon (C.G.) 491441
6. Ved Prakash Verma S/o Chaturbhuj Verma R/o Village Chaweli, Post Kaprikhurd Police Station Ghumka, Distt- Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Shivanand Mishra, Advocate (through Video Conferening) assisted by Mr. Vivekanand Samaddar, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Soumya Rai, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Division Bench

Hon'ble Shri Justice Narendra Kumar Vyas &

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sudhir Kumar

Order on Board

07.10.2026

Per Narendra Kumar Vyas, J.

1. The petitioners have filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for following relief(s):-

(i) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 directing Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to constitute an independent Special Investigation Team (SIT), comprising senior and competent police officers having expertise in economic offences, financial investigation, cyber/digital forensics and corporate fraud, to conduct a fair, impartial, comprehensive, scientific and time-bound investigation into the affairs of M/s Vee Realties India Limited and its interconnected entities, including the circumstances relating to the disputed corporate records and the role, if any, of Respondent Nos. 4 to 6 and such other

persons whose involvement may emerge during the course of investigation;

(ii) Direct the said SIT to ascertain, on the basis of admissible evidence, the persons who actually exercised control over the aforesaid companies, operated or utilised their bank accounts, dealt with their properties, undertook or authorised financial transactions, and were responsible, if any, for the creation, execution or uploading of the disputed corporate records;

(iii) Direct the SIT to undertake appropriate forensic examination of the original corporate and statutory records, including DIR forms, alleged consent documents, signatures, digital signatures, MCA filings/uploads, Board resolutions, statutory returns, banking records property documents and other relevant electronic and documentary evidence, strictly in accordance with law.

(iv) Direct the SIT to examine the financial and corporate transactions of M/s Vee Realties India Limited and its interconnected entities and, in accordance with law, trace the flow of funds and identify the actual beneficiaries, controllers and persons responsible for the affairs of the said entities;

(v) Direct that the investigation shall be conducted independently, objectively and without any preconceived conclusion regarding the culpability or innocence of any person, and that the actual role, control, participation and financial benefit of each person shall be determined only on the basis of admissible evidence;

(vi) Direct the SIT to complete the investigation within such time-bound period as may be fixed by this Hon'ble Court and to submit the appropriate status/final report before the competent Court in accordance with law;

(vii) Pass such other order or direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the criminal proceedings and other consequential proceedings merely on the basis of their names having been reflected as Directors in the records of the Company, whereas, in fact, they were only commission-based field marketing agents and had never exercised any managerial, administrative or financial control over the affairs of Vee Realties India Limited. It is submitted that the petitioners neither participated in any Board meeting nor operated any bank account, signed any statutory document, filed any return, held any shareholding or derived any financial benefit from the affairs of the Company, except the limited commission received for their field-level marketing activities.
3. On the other hand, learned Dy. Govt Advocate appearing for the State, while opposing the petition, submits that for the same relief, the petitioners have filed WPCR No. 460 of 2026 before the Hon'ble Division Bench which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Division Bench on 11.08.2026 by granting liberty to the petitioners to file separetly constituted proceedings, in accordance with the law, for challenging any particular complaint case, cognizance order, order framing charge, FIR, SEBI order of any other specific proceeding or action which they seek to assail, by clearly identifying the impugned order/ proceedings and setting out the factual and legal ground relevant thereto. But they have not challenged any FIR or framing of charge levelled against

them, as such the writ petition is not maintainable and would pray for dismissal of the petition.

4. We have heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State and have carefully perused the pleadings, documents and other material placed on record.

5. The record of the case would demonstrates that earlier also the petitioners have filed the WPCR No. 460 of 2026 before the Coordinate Bench of this Court which has been dismissed on 11.08.2026. The Division Bench while dismissing the petition has recorded its finding in paragraphs 22, 23, 26 and 30 are as under:-

> 22. We may also observe that the petitioners themselves have raised several grievances against different authorities and different orders passed at different points of time. If the petitioners are aggrieved by any particular complaint case, cognizance order, order framing charge, warrant or other consequential proceeding it would be appropriate for them to place the precise order under challenge before the competent Court and to formulate the grounds specifically referable to that proceeding. Similarly, if the petitioners seek to challenge a particular order passed by SEBI or any other statutory authority, the challenge must be directed against the specific order and examined in the light of the statutory scheme governing such proceeding.
>
> 23. The Court is not, at this stage, expressing any opinion on the merits of the allegations made by the petitioners against respondent No.5 or any other private respondent. Likewise, we are not examining or adjudicating upon the petitioners' contention that they were merely commission-based field agents, that their identities or signatures were allegedly misused, or that respondent No.5 continued to exercise control over the Company despite his alleged resignation. These are matters which may be relevant for consideration in an appropriately constituted proceeding where the concerned order, complaint, FIR or statutory action is specifically placed under challenge and the respective respondents are afforded an effective opportunity to meet the allegations.

> 26. It is clarified that we are not dismissing the present petition on the ground that the petitioners can never invoke the jurisdiction of this Court in respect of any of the grievances raised by them. Rather, the dismissal is necessitated by the manner in which numerous distinct proceedings and reliefs have been combined in the present petition. The petitioners would be at liberty to assail any particular proceeding or order, if otherwise permissible in law, by filing a properly constituted and appropriately framed petition, specifically identifying the impugned order/proceeding, the statutory provision involved, the relevant factual foundation and the precise relief sought therein.
>
> 30. However, in the interest of justice, liberty is granted to the petitioners to file appropriate and separately constituted proceedings, in accordance with law, for challenging any particular complaint case, cognizance order, order framing charge, FIR, SEBI order or any other specific proceeding or action which they seek to assail, by clearly identifying the impugned order/proceeding and setting out the factual and legal grounds relevant thereto.

6. Considering the fact that no specific FIR has been questioned in this case and the petitioners have not assailed any order of framing of charge, FIR, SEBI order or any other specific proceeding or action which they seek to assail, therefore, the writ petition is not maintainable at this stage. Similar submission of the petitioners that they are not having control over the company and the respondent No. 4 as control over the company are the defense of the accused which can very well be taken before the trial Court during trial that will vbe considered by the trial Court after apprecaing the evidence only. Further considering well settled legal position of law that this Court cannot conduct roving/fishing inquiry to elicit the fact while hearing the petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

7. Considering the facts of the case that all the grounds which has been taken by the petitioners are their defense which cannot be considered at this stage and also considering the fact that on similar set of relief

sought the Coordinate Bench of this Court has already dismissed the the petition, therefore, we are of the opinion that present is not a fit case to exercise its inherent power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

8. Accordingly, the present petition fails and is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

9. It is made clear this Court has not commented anything on the submission made by either party and on going proceedings pending before the trial Court and the same will be decided by the said court strictly in accordance with the law, evidence and material produced before it without being influenced from dismissal of the writ petition.

Sd/-
(Narendra Kumar Vyas)
Judge

Sd/-
(Sudhir Kumar)
Judge

Santosh