



\$~65 & 50

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 2783/2026 CRL.M.A. 11253/2026**

SONIA BHANDARI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Maninder Singh, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Avneesh A., Ms. Aekta
Vats, Ms. Janvi Narang, Mr. Sagar
Priyadarshi, Ms. Geetanjali Reddy,
Mr. Ankit Sharma and Ms. Anurupita
Kaur, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Spl. Counsel
with Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Panel
Counsel and Ms. Delphina Shinglai
and Mr. Siddharth Bajaj, Advocates.

+ **CRL.M.C. 2755/2026 & CRL.M.A. 11192/2026**

SANJAY BHANDARI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Maninder Singh, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Avneesh A., Ms. Aekta
Vats, Ms. Janvi Narang, Mr. Sagar
Priyadarshi, Ms. Geetanjali Reddy,
Mr. Ankit Sharma and Ms. Anurupita
Kaur, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Spl. Counsel
with Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Panel
Counsel and Ms. Delphina Shinglai
and Mr. Siddharth Bajaj, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

13.04.2026

%



By way of the present petitions filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 the petitioners who are spouses and noticee No. 10 and respondent respectively in MISC DJ ASJ/05/2020 pending before the learned Special Judge (PC Act)(CBI)-10, Rouse Avenue Courts Complex, New Delhi ('Special Judge'), seek setting aside of order dated 28.02.2026 passed by the learned Special Judge.

2. By way of impugned order dated 28.02.2026 the learned Special Judge has dismissed an application filed by the petitioners by which they had sought the striking-off of the common rejoinder filed by the Directorate of Enforcement ('E.D') to the replies filed by noticees Nos. 10 and 16.
3. After a brief hearing in the matter, this court considers it relevant to notice the following observations made by the learned Special Judge in the impugned order :

"16. The applicants i.e. respondent Sanjay Bhandari and noticee no. 10 Smt. Sonia Bhandari have raised certain objections with respect to the common rejoinder filed by the ED. The ED on the other hand has controverted the objections as described above. It cannot be disputed that ED has a right to submit its response to the replies filed by the noticee nos. 10 & 16. Further, if the ED has crossed its limit on certain aspects while filing the rejoinder, as alleged by the present applicants, the objections raised by the applicants can be considered at the time of considering the issue of confiscation of the properties as a whole. If any part of the rejoinder filed by ED is found to be beyond the scope of pleadings under the law, the same can very well be ignored/discarded while passing order on the confiscation of properties. A separate/detailed analysis about details of the properties sought to be confiscated is not required under the present applications as it may multiply the proceedings. In any case, a final view about the confiscation of



properties is to be taken in light of the original pleadings and as per applicable law/rules. There are no sufficient grounds to strike off the rejoinder in a summary manner at this stage.

“17. So in these circumstances, the request for striking off the common rejoinder filed by ED on 06.09.2025 is declined with an observation that the rejoinder filed by the ED shall be considered as per law in light of the objections raised by the applicants. Ordered accordingly.”

(emphasis supplied)

4. The essence of the petitioners’ grievances is that in the common rejoinder filed by the ED, they have mentioned the properties belonging to Sanjay Bhandari in addition to the properties belonging to Sonia Bhandari, which is beyond the original pleadings apart from being beyond the scope of the applicable law. However it is clear from the observations of the learned Special Judge as extracted above, that the learned Special Judge is conscious of the fact that regardless of what may have been stated by the ED or the documents that may have been filed by the ED in their common rejoinder, the issue of confiscation (or other disposition) of the properties would be considered based on the original pleadings and in light of the objections raised by petitioners, in accordance with the applicable law and rules.
5. In view of the above, this court is *not inclined* to entertain the present petitions, which are disposed-of in light of the observations made by the learned Special Judge as extracted above.
6. Pending applications, if any, disposed-of.



7. Needless to add, that all rights and contentions of the parties shall remain open to be placed before the learned Special Judge, in accordance with law.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J
APRIL 13, 2026/hb