



\$~33 to 36

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

+ W.P.(C) 19297/2025 & CM APPL. 80555/2025

RUDRAJEET KUMAR LALPetitioner

Through: Ms. Rupali Singh Kaurav, Advocate.
versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Jivesh Kumar Tiwari, CGSC with
Ms. Nandini Aggarwal & Ms.
Samiksha, Advs. for R1.
Mr. Rahul Tyagi Standing Counsel
for ED with Mr Karan Grover, Mr
Aniket Kumar Singh, Mr Priyansh
Raj Singh Senger, Advocates.

34

+ W.P.(C) 19307/2025 & CM APPL. 80618/2025

ASSEM KUMARPetitioner

Through: Ms. Rupali Singh Kaurav, Advocate.
versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Jivesh Kumar Tiwari, CGSC with
Ms. Nandini Aggarwal & Ms.
Samiksha, Advs. for R1.
Mr. Rahul Tyagi Standing Counsel
for ED with Mr Karan Grover, Mr
Aniket Kumar Singh, Mr Priyansh
Raj Singh Senger, Advocates.

35

+ W.P.(C) 19359/2025 & CM APPL. 80737/2025

BANDANA KARNPetitioner

Through: Ms. Rupali Singh Kaurav, Advocate.



versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through:

Mr Ripudaman Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr Amit Kumar Rana, Advocate for
R1.

Mr. Rahul Tyagi Standing Counsel
for ED with Mr Karan Grover, Mr
Aniket Kumar Singh, Mr Priyansh
Raj Singh Senger, Advocates.

36

+ W.P.(C) 19366/2025 & CM APPL. 80753/2025

BIMLENDRA PRASAD KARN

.....Petitioner

Through:

Ms. Rupali Singh Kaurav, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through:

Mr Jagdish Chandra, CGSC with Ms
Maanya Saxena, Advocate for R1.

Mr. Rahul Tyagi Standing Counsel
for ED with Mr Karan Grover, Mr
Aniket Kumar Singh, Mr Priyansh
Raj Singh Senger, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

27.03.2026

1. On an oral request of the learned counsel appearing for the Union of India, appearance of Mr. Jivesh Kumar Tiwari, CGSC with Ms. Nandini Aggarwal & Ms. Samiksha, Advocates, be treated as marked in the order dated 19.12.2025.

2. These petitions are against the order passed by the Appellate Tribunal in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 26 of the Prevention of Money



Laundering Act, 2002 (PMLA).

3. By the impugned order, the Tribunal dismissed the appeal filed by the petitioners challenging the confirmation order passed by the Adjudicating Authority under the PMLA. Under Section 42 of the PMLA, the appeal against the impugned orders would lie to the jurisdictional High Court.

4. It be noted that the Enforcement Case Information Report (ECIR) has been registered at the Patna Zonal Office of the Enforcement Directorate (ED). The provisional attachment order under Section 5(1) of the PMLA was passed by the Patna Zonal Office of ED. The properties in question are also in Bihar. Merely because the appellate authority is in Delhi, should not be the sole factor to entertain the instant writ petition. A similar view is taken by this Court in the case of *Nium India Pvt. Ltd. v. UOI & Ors.*, 2024 SCC OnLine Del 5201.

5. The Court, therefore, is not inclined to entertain these writ petitions, firstly, on account of not availing the alternate remedy, and secondly, on account of the integral, material and essential cause of action having been arisen outside the jurisdiction of this Court.

6. Accordingly, the writ petitions are dismissed. Liberty stands reserved to take the remedy before the jurisdictional High Court or to file a statutory appeal.

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

8. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

MARCH 27, 2026

ar