



CGHC010179882021



2026:CGHC:44865

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 2974 of 2021

1 - Smt. Soumya Sharma W/o Vidit Sharma Aged About 27 Years R/o Hig/c, 109-A, Shailendra Nagar Raipur Chhattisgarh Presently At Flat No. 1304, Arhint Ayati, Pal Road, Jodhpur, Rajasthan

--- **Petitioner**

Versus

1 - Deputy Director Enforcement Diredctorate Raipur Zonal Office, A-1, Block, 2nd Floor, Purjari Chamber, Pachpedi Naka, Raipur Chhattisgarh 492001

--- **Respondent**

WPC No. 3447 of 2021

1 - Smt. Suman Sharma W/o Shri. Subhash Sharma Aged About 59 Years R/o Hig C 109-A, Shailendra Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh

--- **Petitioner**

Versus

1 - Deputy Director Enforcement Directorate Raipur Zonal Office, A-1 Block, 2nd Floor, Pujari Chamber, Pachpedi Naka, Raipur Chhattisgarh 492001

--- **Respondent**

WPC No. 3378 of 2021

1 - M/s Soumya Broadcasting Pvt. Ltd. R/o Village Kandul, District Raipur Chhattisgarh Through Its Authorized Representative Ritik Barik, S/o Shri Bhavagrahi Barik Aged About 28 Years, 209, Sector - 1, Gali No. 2, Shiv Atta Chakki, Bhaiya Talab, Professor Colony, District Raipur Chhattisgarh 492001., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner

Versus

1 - Deputy Director Enforcement Directorate Raipur, Zonal Office, A - 1,
Block, 2nd Floor, Pujari Chambers, Pachpedi Naka, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
492001., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent

(Cause title is downloaded from CIS Periphery.)

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Abhishek Gupta and Jatin Khatri, Advocates.
For Respondent	:	Dr. Saurabh Kumar Pande, Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad**Order on Board****16.10.2026**

1. Heard.
2. All these captioned writ petitions share a common background and involve the same issues, therefore, they were clubbed, heard together and is decided by this common order.
3. For the sake of convenience, Writ Petition (C) No. 2974 of 2021 is treated as the lead case for the purpose of disposing all the writ petitions.
4. The petitioners in the said petition is seeking for following reliefs:-

“10.1 This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for the entire records of the Adjudicating Authority pertaining to the case of the Petitioner.

10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash Notice dated 14.07.2021 issued under Rule 5 (2) of Prevention of Money Laundering (Taking Possession of Attached or Frozen Properties Confirmed by The Adjudicating Authority) Rules, 2013, the Notice for taking possession under Section 8(4) of the PMLA dated 14.07.2021 and the order dated 23.06.2021 passed by the Adjudicating Authority under section 8 of the PMLA (**Annexure P-1 Colly**).

10.3 Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

5. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that an alternative statutory remedy of appeal is available under Section 26 of the Prevention of Money-Laundering Act, 2002. However, at the relevant time, owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Appellate Tribunal was not functioning, compelling the petitioners to approach this Court directly. He further submits that, as the Appellate Tribunal is now functional, the petitioners may be permitted to avail themselves of the said alternative remedy. However, considering that an interim order has already been passed in favour of the petitioners, learned counsel prays that the interim protection be continued for a reasonable period to enable the petitioners to approach the Appellate Tribunal and until their application for interim relief is considered and decided by the said Tribunal.
6. Learned counsel for the respondent/Deputy Director opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners and submits that, in view of the availability of an efficacious alternative statutory remedy of appeal under Section 26 of the Prevention of Money-Laundering Act, 2002, the petitioners ought to avail themselves of the said remedy before the competent Appellate Tribunal. Accordingly, the writ petitions are not maintainable and the petitioners are not entitled to continuation of the interim protection granted by this Court.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, this Court, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, relegates the petitioners to avail themselves of the statutory remedy of appeal under Section 26 of the Prevention of Money-Laundering Act, 2002, before the concerned Appellate Tribunal within a period of 45 days from today. The petitioners are further directed to file an application for interim relief along with the appeal. In the event that the appeal is filed within the aforesaid period, the Appellate Tribunal is requested to consider and decide the application for interim relief within a further period of 15 days. In the meanwhile, the interim order passed by this Court shall continue to operate for a period of 60 days from today, or until the application for interim relief is decided by the Appellate Tribunal, whichever is earlier.
8. With this observation and direction, the batch of petitions stands **disposed of.**

Sd/-
(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge