



\$~22

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **MISC. APPEAL(PMLA) 79/2025 & CM APPL. 68509/2025 -**
STAY
DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENTAppellant
Through: Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Panel
Counsel for ED.
versus

M/S TRIDENT INFOSOL PRIVATE LIMITEDRespondent
Through: Mr. Pavan Narang, Sr. Adv.,
with Mr. Himanshu Sethi, Ms.
Aishwarya Chhabra, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

% **ORDER**
01.04.2026

MISC. APPEAL(PMLA) 79/2025

1. This appeal has been filed under Section 42 of Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 challenging the order dated 29.05.2025 passed by the learned Appellate Tribunal under the SAFEMA at New Delhi in FPA-PMLA-3962/DLI/2021 titled "*Trident Infosol Pvt. Ltd. Vs. The Deputy Director Directorate of Enforcement, Delhi*" disposing of the appeal filed by the respondent herein in the following terms:

"Considered the submissions from both the sides. In view of the discharge of the Appellant in the PMLA case, and as there be no stay from any higher judicial authority in the matter, the present appeal is hereby allowed and the impugned order is set aside. However, Respondents would be at liberty to seek revival of the case in case the order of the



Trial Court is reversed by the Hon'ble High Court. Accordingly, the properties of the appellant herein attached vide the impugned order shall stand de-attached. In case possession has already been taken, the same shall be restored to the Appellant. The needful shall be done within six weeks and Appellant shall be informed suitably.

The appeal is accordingly, allowed."

2. We are informed that as far as the discharge of the respondent in CT Case No. 01/2022 is concerned, the same has been challenged by the appellant in Criminal Revision Petition No. 210/2025 which is stated to listed tomorrow, that is, 02.04.2026.

3. In the meantime, as far as the present appeal is concerned, by an order dated 03.11.2025, this Court had directed as under:

"8. Mr. Pawan Narang, learned senior counsel for the respondent, on instructions, submits that without prejudice to the rights and contentions, they are ready to submit bank guarantee of the equivalent total amount for the property attached as per the following details: -

- a) Fixed deposit of Rs. 2,08,00,000 opened on 20.02.2020 with Counterparty Account No. 113410003131 in the name of Mis Trident Infosol Pvt. Ltd. in ICICI Bank.*
- b) An amount of Rs. 15,12,419 in bank account number 30204790991 of Mis Trident Infosol Pvt. Ltd. maintained with State Bank of India, Parishrama Bhavan (Hyderabad) APIDC Bldg., Basheer Bagh Road Hyderabad, Telangana.*
- c) An amount of Rs. 13,12,581 in bank account number 31732973727 of Mis Trident Infosol Pvt. Ltd. maintained with State Bank of India, Commercial Branch, Plot No. 3, 4 DDA Bldg, Vardhman Trade Centre, Nehru Place, New Delhi - 110019.*

9. Keeping in mind the overall facts of the case and without prejudice to the rights and



contentions of either of the parties, the respondent is permitted to submit a bank guarantee, for an initial period of one year, for the entire amount of Rs. 2,36,25,000/- subject to the satisfaction of the Adjudicating Authority concerned. The said bank guarantee is to be renewed at least a month before its date of expiry.

10. Let said bank guarantee be submitted within a period of six weeks from today.

11. Once the above said bank guarantee is presented and accepted, the appellant herein would take requisite steps for refund of the amount of Rs. 15,12,419/- and Rs.13,12,581/- as mentioned in paragraph 8 (b) and (c) above. The Adjudicating Authority shall also send a report about the submission of any such bank guarantee and about its acceptance.”

4. The respondent, however, complained that in spite of furnishing of the bank guarantee of the entire sum of Rs. 2,36,25,000/- (Rupees Two Crore Thirty Six Lakhs Twenty Five Thousand only), the attached FDRs have not been released by the bank. Therefore, *vide* order dated 20.03.2026, this Court directed as under:

“6. In view of the foregoing, the properties as mentioned in the paragraph 8 of the Order dated 03.11.2025 be released to the Respondent, subject to the terms and conditions of the said Order date 03.11.2025.”

5. Today, the learned counsel for the appellant has handed over the instructions dated 30.03.2026 addressed to the Branch Manager, ICICI Bank, Jasola Vihar Branch, stating that in view of the above-mentioned orders passed by this Court, the FDR stands released.

6. In view of the above, the Bank is directed to comply with the above orders.



7. From a reading of the impugned order itself, it is evident that the same has been passed subject to the outcome of the revision petition filed by the appellant herein.

8. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the respondent submits that the bank guarantee submitted by the respondent in terms of the order dated 03.11.2025, can continue subject to the outcome of the said revision petition and shall be periodically renewed during the pendency of the same.

9. We find the above offer to be fair.

10. Accordingly, we dispose of the present appeal by directing the respondent to continue to renew the said bank guarantee during the pendency of the above mentioned review petition, and further direct that the bank guarantee shall be dealt with subject to the outcome of the Revision Petition filed by the appellant and referred herein above.

11. The appeal, alongwith any pending application(s), is disposed of in terms of the aforesaid.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

APRIL 1, 2026/lks/na/ik