



2026:DHC:1496-DB



\$~23

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

Date of decision: 19.02.2026

+ **MISC. APPEAL(PMLA) 49/2024 & CM APPL. 76423/2024**
PUNJAB NATIONAL BANKAppellant

Through: Mr.Keshav Thakur, Mr.Rajesh
Chauhan, Mr.Mahesh Prasad,
Mr.Prithvi Thakur and
Ms.Aayushi Meena, Advs.

versus

**THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF
ENFORCEMENT SRINAGAR AND ORS**Respondents

Through: Mr.Rahul Tyagi, SC (ED) with
Ms.Priya Rai, Mr.Karan
Grover, Mr.Aniket Kumar
Singh, Mr.Priyansh Raj Singh,
Mr.Pawan Gangwal and
Ms.Bhawna Gandhi, Advs.

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

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This appeal has been filed under Section 42 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (hereinafter referred to as 'PMLA'), challenging the order dated 14.06.2024 passed by the learned Appellate Tribunal under SAFEMA in FPA-PMLA-2734/SNR/2018 titled *Punjab National Bank v. The Deputy Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Srinagar*.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: REYMON VASHIST
Signing Date: 21.02.2026
17:32:08

MISC. APPEAL(PMLA) 49/2024

Page 1 of 3



2026:DHC:1496-DB



2. The learned counsel for the respondents raises a preliminary objection on the maintainability of the present appeal before this Court, by contending that not only the entire cause of action has arisen within the territorial jurisdiction of the Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir, but also the appellant itself is situated in Jammu, as would be evident from the Memo of Parties.

3. The learned counsel for the appellant, on the other hand, submits that as the Tribunal is situated in Delhi and even the Adjudicating Authority is situated in Delhi, this Court would have the territorial jurisdiction to entertain the present appeal.

4. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

5. Section 42 of the PMLA reads as under:

“42. Appeal to High Court. - Any person aggrieved by any decision or order of the Appellate Tribunal may file an appeal to the High Court within sixty days from the date of communication of the decision or order of the Appellate Tribunal to him on any question of law or fact arising out of such order:

Provided that the High Court may, if it is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal within the said period, allow it to be filed within a further period not exceeding sixty days. Explanation. For the purposes of this section, High Court means

(i) the High Court within the jurisdiction of which the aggrieved party ordinarily resides or carries on business or personally works for gain; and

(ii) where the Central Government is the aggrieved party, the High Court within the



2026:DHC:1496-DB



jurisdiction of which the respondent, or in a case where there are more than one respondent, any of the respondents, ordinarily resides or carries on business or personally works for gain.”

6. A reading of the above would clearly show that it is only the High Court where the aggrieved party ordinarily resides or carries on business or personally works for gain, which will have the territorial jurisdiction to entertain the appeal. As the Memo of Parties itself shows that the concerned branch of the appellant is situated at Jammu, we find merit in the preliminary objection raised by the learned counsel for the respondents.

7. Accordingly, the appeal along with the pending application is dismissed for lack of territorial jurisdiction. However, we grant liberty to the appellant to avail of its remedies in accordance with law before the court of competent jurisdiction.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

FEBRUARY 19, 2026/ns/pb