



2026:DHC:8826



\$~75

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 05.10.2026

#

CNR No. DLHC010476342026

+

CRL.REV.P. 589/2026 & CRL. M.A 31043/2026, 31044/2026

M/S SUJATA HOTELS PVT LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shadan Farasat (Sr. Adv) along
with Ms. Varisha Sharma, Mr.
Kaustubh Chaturvedi, Advs.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Prithish Sabharwal (SC) for UOI
along with Ms. Vanshika Kapoor, Ms.
Shweta Singh, Advs.
Mr. D.P. Singh (ASG and SC) along
with Mr. Manu Mishra, Mr. Imaan
Khera, Ms. Garima Saxena, Ms.
Shreya Dutt, Advs.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA****SACHIN DATTA, J. (Oral)****CRL. M.A 31045/2026 (SEEKING PERMISSION TO FILE
LENGTHY LIST OF DATES AND SYNOPSIS)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

**CRL.M.A. 31046/2026 [EX(FILING CERTIFIED/ CLEARER COPIES
OF ANNEX.)]****CRL.M.A. 31047/2026 [EX(FILING CERTIFIED/ ORIGINAL
COPIES OF ANNEX.)]**

3. The applications are disposed of with a direction to file certified/
clearer, original copies of annexures within a period of two weeks from
today.

CRL.REV.P.589/2026

Page 1 of 4

**CRL.REV.P. 589/2026**

4. The present revision petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing an order dated 10.09.2026, passed by the Ld. Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, South-West Dwarka, New Delhi in Ct. Case No. 22/2019, titled '*Directorate of Enforcement vs. M/s. Lara Project L.L.P. & Ors.*' (hereinafter "*Impugned Order*"). *Vide* the Impugned Order, the Trial Court directed framing of charges against Accused No. 12 (petitioner) under Section 4 read with Section 3 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (hereinafter "*PMLA*"). Accused No. 12/Company is the sole petitioner in this revision petition.

5. The prosecution's case concerns the award of contracts by IRCTC to the petitioner for operating BNR Hotels at Ranchi and Puri. It is alleged that the petitioner herein was involved in manipulation of the tender process and transfer of some land at an undervalued price to a company called M/s DMCPL, a company associated with the alleged beneficiaries as part of an unlawful arrangement.

6. The concerned land transaction which has been referred to in the impugned order includes certain registered Sale Deeds dated 25.02.2005. The hotel contracts themselves were awarded on 27.12.2006. The sale deeds were executed by individuals who happened to be directors in the petitioner company. The petitioner company itself is not a party to the said Sale Deeds.

7. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that in Paragraphs Nos. 213 to 217 of the impugned order, the Trial Court describes the petitioner as a beneficiary in the hotel tender and attributes assistance in the acquisition, use, and projection of the land to the petitioner. It also relies upon the relationship between the individuals involved and the company's



directors. The petitioner challenges the attribution of these personal transactions to the company.

8. He further points out that Section 70(1) of the PMLA, 2002 proceeds upon a contravention committed by a company and addresses the liability of the company and persons in charge of and responsible for its business. Section 70(2) likewise concerns a contravention committed by a company with the consent, connivance or neglect on the part of its directors or other officers. It is pointed out that Explanation (2) permits prosecution of the company independently of the prosecution or conviction of an individual.

9. It is emphasised on behalf of the petitioner that these provisions do not dispense with material connecting the company to the alleged contravention. It is submitted that a company necessarily acts through individuals, and the acts of its directors may, therefore, be attributable to it where the material establishes such a connection. However, director's personal acts or liability cannot be automatically transferred to the company merely because they hold that office. It is submitted that the acts attributable to the company and their connection with an activity falling within the scope of Section 3 of the PMLA must be specifically identified.

10. The relevant issue is attribution of a specific act to the company itself independent of the actions of its directors. It is pointed out that Paragraph 214 of the impugned order contains a general conclusion that the company assisted in acquisition use or projection of the land. However, it is submitted that the impugned order neither identifies the specific material directly connecting the company with any offending activity nor explain why the director's personal land transactions are attributable to the company. As such, it is contended that the evidentiary link required to bring



the company within the sweep of Section 3 is missing.

11. It is submitted that describing the company's culpability as co-extensive with that of the directors does not supply the missing condition.

12. *Prima facie*, the issue as to whether the acts of the directors can be attributed to the company in the peculiar factual conspectus requires further consideration in the context of the above submissions.

13. Issue notice.

14. Learned counsel, as aforesaid, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

15. Learned counsel for the respondents seeks four weeks time to file a reply. Let the same be filed within the said period.

16. The reply shall refer to the precise material which supports the involvement of the company in the concerned activity falling within the sweep of Section 3 of the PMLA, 2002.

17. Let rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

18. Considering the circumstances, till the next date of hearing, the operation of the impugned order and further proceedings pursuant to it in Ct. Case No. 22/2019 shall be stayed insofar as they concern the petitioner herein.

19. List on 03.12.2026.

SACHIN DATTA, J

OCTOBER 5, 2026/*uk*