



\$~ 21 to 24

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

+ W.P.(C) 13066/2023, CM APPL. 51591/2023, CM APPL. 13696/2024, CM APPL. 38824/2024, CM APPL. 38825/2024 & CM APPL. 70228/2025

M/S LALL CONSTRUCTION INDIA LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Neeraj Malhotra, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Jeevesh Mehta, Mr. Nihit Dalmia,
Mr. Nimish Gupta and Ms. Bhavya
Bathla, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishrra, Mr. Sanjiv Kr
Saxena, Mr. Mukesh Kr Tiwari, Ms.
Reba Jena Mishra and Ms. Poonam
Shukla, Advs.

22

+ W.P.(C) 13067/2023, CM APPL. 51593/2023, CM APPL. 38817/2024, CM APPL. 38818/2024, CM APPL. 38830/2024 & CM APPL. 70226/2025

M/S LALL CONSTRUCTION INDIA LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Neeraj Malhotra, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Jeevesh Mehta, Mr. Nihit Dalmia,
Mr. Nimish Gupta and Ms. Bhavya
Bathla, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishrra, Mr. Sanjiv Kr
Saxena, Mr. Mukesh Kr Tiwari, Ms.
Reba Jena Mishra and Ms. Poonam
Shukla, Advs.



23

+

W.P.(C) 13587/2023, CM APPL. 53627/2023, CM APPL. 38822/2024, CM APPL. 38823/2024, CM APPL. 38828/2024 & CM APPL. 70223/2025

M/S LALL CONSTRUCTION INDIA LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Neeraj Malhotra, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Jeevesh Mehta, Mr. Nihit Dalmia,
Mr. Nimish Gupta and Ms. Bhavya
Bathla, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Mr. Sanjiv Kr
Saxena, Mr. Mukesh Kr Tiwari, Ms.
Reba Jena Mishra and Ms. Poonam
Shukla, Advs.

24

+

W.P.(C) 13801/2023, CM APPL. 54590/2023, CM APPL. 13688/2024, CM APPL. 38811/2024, CM APPL. 38812/2024 & CM APPL. 70235/2025

M/S LALL CONSTRUCTION INDIA LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Neeraj Malhotra, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Jeevesh Mehta, Mr. Nihit Dalmia,
Mr. Nimish Gupta and Ms. Bhavya
Bathla, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERSRespondents

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Mr. Sanjiv Kr
Saxena, Mr. Mukesh Kr Tiwari, Ms.
Reba Jena Mishra and Ms. Poonam
Shukla, Advs.



CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

30.03.2026

%

1. The challenge is continued to the decision of forfeiture of the earnest money deposited by the petitioner. It is pointed out by Mr. Neeraj Malhotra, learned senior counsel that *vide* the impugned communication through email, it has been decided to initiate action for forfeiture of Earnest Money Deposit (**EMD**) and banning of the business of the petitioners.
2. It is pointed out by learned counsel for the respondent that the banning of business order has now been lifted. To that extent, the relief stands satisfied.
3. With respect to forfeiture of EMD, there does not seem to be any show cause notice. The reasons for forfeiture of EMD have also not been adequately assigned in the impugned communication. The impugned communication is one-line decisions taken by the respondents. The same would not be justified in law.
4. In view thereof, the Court deems it appropriate to set aside the decision of forfeiture of the EMD. However, liberty is granted to the respondent to issue the show cause notice to the petitioner and upon affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, to take the appropriate decision in accordance of law.
5. If the grievance of the petitioner is not fully mitigated, thereafter, it shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.
6. Let the show cause notice be issued within thirty (30) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The final decision be taken within



four months, thereafter.

7. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petitions, along with all pending applications, stand disposed of.

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

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 30, 2026/Sh/ss