

CT Case No.34/2022  
CNR No. DLCT11-000811-2022  
ECIR/DLZO-I/01/2019 dt. 24.01.2019.  
ED vs. M/s OPG Securities Pvt. Ltd. & Anr.

24.07.2025

**(Present proceedings have been conducted on Hybrid Mode)**

Present : Sh. Shailesh N. Pathak (in person), Sh. Simon Benjamin and Sh. Manish Jain (both through VC), Ld. SPPs for ED.

Sh. R.S. Janwa, Sh. Saumitr Parashar, Sh. Mirnal Radhewal and Ms. Yamini Thakur, Ld. Counsels for ED.

**A-2** Sanjay Gupta for self and for **A-1** M/s OPG Securities Pvt. Ltd. is present through VC.

Sh. Pranav Jain and Sh. Shrey Nautiyal, Ld. Counsels for **A-1**.

Sh. Harshit Sethi, Ms. Mansi Tripathi and Sh. Kartik Yadav, Ld. Counsels for **A-2**.

1. A digital device of size 4 TB was got cloned by ED after taking permission of this Court on 07.07.2025. Cloned copy thereof stands supplied to A-1. In the cloned copy supplied to A-1, it is submitted by Counsel Shri Pranav Jain, there is a file format that is not opening. Ld. Counsel Pranav Jain seeks assistance of IO regarding this. Mr. Pathak on behalf of ED submits that the IO would try to render the requisite assistance on the next date to counsel for A-1.

2. Insofar as A-2 is concerned, counsels submit that they have received 2.68 TB of the data contained in the digital device. In addition, it is submitted, the data contained in a 64 GB Pen Drive also stands received by them. As regards the rest of the digital data, counsels for A-2 submit that they would collect the

same from A-1.

3. On 14.07.2025, Ld. SPPs for ED had furnished a Compliance Report setting out therein the list of unrelieved documents which comprises documents that can be inspected and those that cannot be inspected. Copy of the Compliance Report is supplied to the respective counsels for both the accused.

4. As regards the unrelieved documents to which ED has no objection for inspection, the accused persons are at liberty to inspect the same. For this, the counsels for accused persons shall coordinate with the IO.

5. However, as regards the unrelieved documents which ED does not desire to be inspected, it is pointed out by SPPs for ED that further investigation is underway qua other entities and an inspection of such documents would prejudice further investigation. It is further their submission that these documents would be of no help to A-1 and A-2 at this stage of arguments on charge. They thus submit that the matter be posted for consideration on the point of framing of charge. On the other hand, Ld. Counsels for A-1 point out that on 18.02.2025, the IO had made a submission to the Court that investigation qua A-1 was already complete. It is further their submission that under the guise of further investigation, the ED is resorting to infringement of valuable rights of accused persons. They aver that ECIR was registered on 24.01.2019, cognizance of offences was taken on 20.01.2023, and despite lapse of several years further investigation in this matter is not yet concluded. At this stage, Ld. Counsels for A-1 and A-2 submit that they would like to furnish

written response to the Compliance Report submitted by ED on 14.07.2025. Their written response may be filed on the next date.

6. The IO shall appear on the next date of hearing in order to render assistance qua non-opening of digital file(s).

7. At this stage, on behalf of A-2 an application is filed seeking permission to travel to U.K. from 10.08.2025 to 30.08.2025 and few other reliefs. Copy of the application is supplied to Ld. SPPs for ED. **This application shall come for reply/ arguments on 29.07.2025 at 2 P.M.**

8. The matter be listed for hearing on the aspects of unrelieved upon documents and non-opening of digital file(s) on **12.08.2025.**

(M. P. Singh)  
Special Judge (PC Act) CBI-02  
RADC/New Delhi/24.07.2025