

  
**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT  
JODHPUR**

S.B. Criminal Writ Petition No. 877/2026

1. Jalpal Saini S/o Sh Likhmi Chand, Aged About 35 Years,  
R/o Ward No. 19, Mahabir Colony, Sadbhawana Nagar  
Road, Sri Ganganagar
2. Aditya Kumar S/o Bhoop Singh, Aged About 36 Years,  
Director, M/s Choudhary Build Mart Pvt. Ltd., 404, 4Th  
Floor, K.j. City Tower, Ashok Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur,  
Rajasthan
3. Amandeep Tarad S/o Om Prakash Tarad, Aged About 41  
Years, R/o Ward No. 9 Near Railway Station, Sadulshahar,  
Sriganganagar
4. Sunita Choudhary W/o Amandeep Tarad, Aged About 39  
Years, R/o 3-H-16, Jawahar Nagar, Sriganganagar
5. Om Prakash Tarad S/o Gopi Ram, Aged About 70 Years,  
R/o Ward No. 9 Near Railway Station, Sadulshahar,  
Sriganganagar

----Petitioners

Versus

1. Union Of India, Through The Secretary, Ministry Of  
Finance, North Block, New Delhi 110001
2. Directorate Of Enforcement, Through Its Director,  
Department Of Revenue, Ministry Of Finance, Government  
Of India.
3. Additional Director, Directorate Of Enforcement,  
Department Of Revenue, Ministry Of Finance, Government  
Of India, Zonal Office, Jaipur.

----Respondents

---

|                   |   |                                                                        |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner(s) | : | Mr. Muktesh Maheshwari                                                 |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Mr. N.S. Chandawat, P.P.<br>Ms. Divyanshi Thanvi for Mr. B.P.<br>Bohra |

---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FARJAND ALI**

**Judgment / Order**

**18/03/2026**

1. The matter came up before this Court on 25.02.2026 and on that date, learned counsel for the petitioner was directed to supply copy of the writ petition along with annexed material to learned counsel for the respondent present before this Court.
2. The matter was directed to be listed on 09.03.2026 to see the initial response. Today, Ms. Divyanshi Thanvi for Mr. B.P. Bohra for respondent-Enforcement Directorate appears and seeks some more time to complete her instructions from the respondent authorities.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner insisting for passing an ad interim order in light of the availability of strong ground in his favour.
4. A cursory look over the matter, reflects that an FIR No.RC0312021A0001 came to be lodged by the CBI for the alleged act of misappropriation of property, cheating, fabrication of false documents and using a false document as a genuine knowing it to be false as well as under the penal provision of Prevention of Corruption Act. A Co-ordinate Bench vide order dated 29.06.2021 passed in S.B. Criminal Misc. Petition No.2999/2021 made indulgence in the matter and passed an interim order of restraining arrest of the petitioner. It is contended that for the same set of accusation, cause of action, substance, truth and the same incident, now again the matter has been taken up by the respondent enforcement directorate and a summon (Annex-5) has been issued to the petitioner directing him to appear in their office on 15.05.2025. It is contended that now the summon has been served upon the petitioner and he is obligated to mark his

presence in the office of the respondent-enforcement Directorate on 18.03.2026.

5. A perusal of the Annexure-5 revealing that several places on the notice have been left blank and it is not clarifying as to for what purpose the petitioner has been summoned.

6. Be that as it may, since the respondent seeks time to respond and the date for appearance of the petitioner in the office of respondent department is expiring today; as an interim measure, it is directed that till the next date of hearing, further proceedings in relation to summon No. PMLA/SUMMON/JPZO/2025/2028/661, issued by the Directorate Enforcement, Ministry of Finance, Government of India shall remain stayed.

7. List the matter on 15.04.2026.

**(FARJAND ALI),J**