



\$~58

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 1562/2025**

RAMAN SOKHAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shivam Sharma and Mr. Utkarsh
Bhushan. Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajit Kumar Pathak, SPC with Ms.
Akriti Pathak, Advocate for R-1.
Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Spl. Counsel
with Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Panel
Counsel with Mr. Kartik Sabharwal,
Advocate for ED.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

% **22.05.2025**

CRL.M.A. 14562/2025 (for ad-interim ex-parte directions to the Respondents to not take coercive action against the Petitioner)

1. Counsel for Petitioner contends that the proceedings initiated against the Petitioner under the provisions of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002¹, are fundamentally flawed in the absence of a scheduled or predicate offence. It is submitted that without the existence of such a predicate offence, as defined under Section 2(1)(y) read with the Schedule of the PMLA, the invocation of the Act is legally unsustainable. On this ground, the Petitioner urges that the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India ought to be exercised to prevent the abuse of process and to uphold the sanctity of legal procedure.

2. By way of interim relief, the Petitioner seeks directions restraining

¹ "PMLA"



Respondent No. 2 from taking any coercive steps during the pendency of the present writ petition.

3. Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Special Counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent No. 2, opposes the prayer for interim relief. He submits that the investigation is at a nascent stage and remains ongoing as regards the role of the present Petitioner. It is his submission that the jurisdictional foundation for the case under the PMLA is satisfied, as the impugned Enforcement Case Information Report² arises out of FIR Nos. 449/2023 and 248/2019, both of which involve offences specified in the Schedule to the PMLA. He further points out that several connected petitions have been instituted by the entities involved, including the partnership firm in question, but no interim protection has been granted in any of those matters.

4. Of particular significance is the fact that in CRM-M No. 48548/2023, a petition filed by the present Petitioner before the High Court of Punjab and Haryana assailing the underlying FIR No. 449/2023, no interim relief was granted by the said Court. This, Mr. Hossain submits, demonstrates that the claims now pressed before this Court have already been canvassed and did not merit protection.

5. Upon consideration of the submissions advanced and having regard to the nature of proceedings and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the opinion that no case is made out at this juncture for the grant of interim relief. The question of whether a predicate offence exists and whether the ECIR can be sustained on that basis is a matter that requires deeper examination, which cannot be undertaken without affording an opportunity to all parties to present a complete record.



6. Nonetheless, it is clarified that the Petitioner shall remain at liberty to avail appropriate legal remedies, in the event of any apprehension of arrest or coercive action by the investigating authorities.

7. The present application is accordingly dismissed.

W.P.(CRL) 1562/2025

8. Issue notice. Mr. Ajit Kumar Pathak, SPC for Respondent No. 1 and Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Spl. Counsel for Respondent No. 2, accept notice.

9. Reply, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

10. Renotify on 26th August, 2025.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 22, 2025/as