

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).16600/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 24-09-2025 in CRLP No. 9170/2023 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras]

M/S. PEE AND DEE LANDS HOLDINGS (P) LTD.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 264202/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 264204/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 141770/2026 - PASSING APPROPRIATE ORDER OR DECREE UNDER ARTICLE 142 OF THE CONSTITUTION

WITH

SLP(Crl) No. 16756/2025 (II-C)

FOR

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 265720/2025

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 265723/2025

FOR PASSING APPROPRIATE ORDER OR DECREE UNDER ARTICLE 142 OF THE CONSTITUTION ON IA 141914/2026

IA No. 265720/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 265723/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 141914/2026 - PASSING APPROPRIATE ORDER OR DECREE UNDER ARTICLE 142 OF THE CONSTITUTION

Date : 07-09-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAY BISHNOI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Gaurav Agarwal, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Akhil Bhansali, Adv.
 Mr. Anish R. Shah, AOR
 Ms. Fouziya Farheen, Adv.
 Ms. Sneha Natraj, Adv.
 Mr. Ankit Sahu, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. B. Karunakaran, AOR
Ms. Pooja Lakshmi, Adv.
Azka Sheikhhkalia, Adv.
Mr. Akhil Krishnan. A, Adv.

Mr. Siddhartha Jha, AOR
Mr. Kartik Jha, Adv.
Ms. Neetika Sud, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The allegations in the FIR of which quashing has been denied by the High Court are in respect of execution of transfer documents in favour of the petitioner(s) by persons who held no authority. There are also allegations of creating bogus documents to enable such transfers.
2. The petitioner(s) claim that parties have now entered into a compromise with the complainant and based on such compromise, certain payments have been made to the complainant. By setting up that compromise, this Court's power under Article 142 of the Constitution of India has been invoked for quashing the proceedings.
3. To ensure that those transfer documents do not pertain to property of persons who are not privy to the settlement, we deem it appropriate to require the petitioner(s) to file a detailed affidavit disclosing the following:
 - (i) The details of the sale deed including the name of the vendor and the vendee in the sale deed;
 - (ii) Whether the properties, which was subject matter of the sale, were recorded in the revenue

records, or other property records, in the name of the vendor;

(iii) Whether any allegation has been made in respect of those sale transactions being executed by an impersonator of the vendor. In case there is an allegation of impersonation of the original owners, whether investigation was carried out on those allegations. If so, whether those allegations were found, *prima facie*, genuine or false; and

(iv) Whether the compromise entered between the parties is signed by all those whose properties were transacted through disputed sale deeds.

4. Such affidavit may be filed along with relevant documents within four weeks from today after serving a copy on the counsel representing the State.

5. Within two weeks thereafter, the State's counsel shall seek instructions on the correctness of those averments in the affidavit and, if required, file an affidavit in response to the said affidavit.

6. List these matters after eight weeks.

(CHETAN ARORA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(SAPNA BANSAL)
COURT MASTER (NSH)