



\$~113

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 4480/2026**

PURNIMA BUILDMART PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Raman Kapoor, Sr. Adv. with
Ms. Jyoti Taneja, Ms. Shikha Bagga,
Ms. Ishika, Mr. Abhishek Mishra and
Ms. Muskan Puri, Advs.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA MINISTRY OF CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND
ORS.**Respondents

Through: Ms. Shakun Sudha, SPC with Mr.
Shivam Sharma and Ms. Aashna
Mehra, GPs for R-1.
Mr. Bhaskar Bhardwaj, Mr. Vakeel
Ahmed, Ms. Nandini Agarwal and
Mr. Sahil, Advs. for R-2.
Mr. A. S. Chandiok, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Sujoy Dutta, Mr. Vibhor Kapoor,
Mr. Sumit Chandiok, Mr. Shubham
Raghuwanshi, Mr. Tanpreet Gulati
and Mr. Nayan Grover, Advs. for R-3
to 7.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

06.04.2026

CM APPL. 21834/2026 (EXEMPTION)

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.



W.P.(C) 4480/2026 and CM APPL. 21833/2026

3. The petition has been filed seeking following reliefs:

“a) Issue a writ of mandamus to forthwith restrain Respondents no. 3 to 7 or their associates and kith and kin from manipulating or updating any data of the petitioner company at the MCA portal or before any authority without having any authorization from any of the present three Directors, whose names mentioned at the Masters data.

b) Issue appropriate directions restraining Respondent No. 7 (M/s Aekom Legal) and its partners, associates, and employees from practicing in relation to the Petitioner, M/s Purnima Buildmart Private Limited or any other company wherein the controlling shareholding vests with Mrs. Purnima Gupta — in any forum, in view of the demonstrated conflict of interest and complicity in fraudulent filings;

c) Direct Respondent No. 1 to deactivate the MCA login credentials of CS Yash Jain (yash.jain1309@gmail.com) and CS Sourabh Gupta (gupta.sourabh888@gmail.com) and their DIR nos. having no COP to work as CS professionals, to prevent further misuse pending disposal of the disciplinary complaints;

d) Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing Respondent No. 1 – Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA) – to disclose complete technical and transactional details in respect of all impugned e-filings made on behalf of the Petitioner Company, including: a. IP addresses, b. date and time stamps, c. and any associated system logs, so as to identify the origin and authorship of such filings, and to ascertain the role of Respondent No. 7 – M/s Aekom Legal – and its representatives in the said transactions;

e) Pass any such other and further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice.”

4. The petitioner is a company incorporated under the provisions of the Companies Act, 2013 and is managed by its Directors.

5. The sole grievance of the petitioner pertains to alleged unauthorized and fraudulent statutory filings made on the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (**hereinafter “MCA”**) portal, which, according to the petitioner, have resulted in manipulation of its corporate records and alteration of its management structure.

6. On perusal of the petition, it appears that the petitioner has made a



complaint to The Institute of Company Secretaries of India (**hereinafter “ICSI”**) in a prescribed format, against some of the respondents, alleging professional misconduct. The same will have to be dealt with in accordance with the Company Secretaries Act, 1980 (**hereinafter “1980’s Act”**) and the rules known as the Company Secretaries Procedure of Investigations of Professional and Other Misconduct and Conduct of Cases Rules, 2007 (**hereinafter “Rules 2007”**).

7. Mr. Bhaskar Bhardwaj, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 2 contends that the cognizance of the complaint has been taken in accordance with the scheme of the 1980’s Act and the Rules of 2007 made therein. He further submits that the complaint has been filed in month of August 2025 and as of now, after some preliminary investigation, the same is under consideration with some higher authorities.

8. The complaint seems to be at the stage of forming a *prima facie* opinion, depending upon the same, it will have to be further dealt with, in accordance with the scheme of the 1980’s Act and the 2007 Rules. This exercise of forming of a *prima facie* opinion and taking the complaint to its logical conclusion shall be carried out within a period of six weeks from today.

9. Mr. A. S. Chandiok, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of respondent nos. 3 to 7 submits that the writ itself is not maintainable, however, the Court is not going to deal with all those complaints. When the complaint is made, the same will have to be decided.

10. The petition is confined to the aforesaid aspect only.

11. Accordingly, the instant petition stands disposed of along with the pending application.



12. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 6, 2026/Sh/ss