CGHC010303242026 2026:CGHC:35180-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPCR No. 460 of 2026

1 - Rekha Neware W/o Sh. Ramdayal Neware Aged About 48 Years R/o Ward No. 10, Gram Tirodi, Vtc Kharpadiya, Po Tirodi, Sub District Katangi, Distt. Balaghat, Madhya Pradesh 481449.

2 - Nilesh Keshorao Gajbhiye S/o Sh. Keshorao Gajbhiye Aged About 41 Years R/o New Shastri Ward, Near Yashoda Sabhgruh, Vtc Gondiya, Po Gondia, Sub District Gondiya, Distt. Gondiya, Maharashtra 441601.

3 - Panchu Lal Pandhre S/o Sh. Moti Ram Pandhre Aged About 39 Years R/o Village Jamdi, P.S. Kasauli, Distt. Gondiya, Maharashtra.

4 - Buddhadas Premdas Ramtake S/o Sh. Premdas Ramtake Aged About 46 Years R/o Dhwani Apartment Sister Colony Naginabag, Chandrapur, Distt. Chandrapur, Maharashtra.

... Petitioners

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Distt. Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - The Registrar of Companies Ashok Pingley Bhawan, 1st Floor, Municipal Corporation, Nehru Chowk, P.S. Civil Line, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Securities And Exchange Board of India Through The Chairman, Plot No. C4-A, G Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai 400051, Maharashtra.

4 - Ministry of Corporate Affairs Through The Principal Secretary, Government of India, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi 110001.

5 - Kamlesh Verma S/o Paltan Ram Verma Resident of House No. 2, Riddhi Siddhi Colony, Dongargaon Road, Phase 1, Ward No. 45, Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.

6 - Udaksha Kumar Verma S/o Bhaiya Ji Verma R/o Qr. Near Hanuman Mandir, Ward Jiratola, Rajnandgaon, C.G., Presently At House No. 2, Riddhi Siddhi Colony, Dongargaon Road, Phase-1, Ward No. 45, P.S. Kotwali, Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.

7 - Ved Prakash Verma S/o Chaturbhuj Verma R/o Village Chaweli, Post Kaprikhurd, P.S. Ghumka, Distt. Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioners	**:**	Mr. Shivanand Mishra, Advocate (through Video Conferening) assisted by Mr. Vivekanand Samaddar, Advocate
For State	**:**	Mr. Shashank Thakur, Additional Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Order on Board

***Per* Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**

11.08.2026

1. Heard Mr. Shivanand Mishra, learned counsel (through Video Conferening) assisted by Mr. Vivekanand Samaddar, learned counsel for the petitioners as well as Mr. Shashank Thakur, learned Additional Advocate General, appearing for the State.

2. The petitioners have filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for following relief(s):-

> *"1. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari quashing Complaint Case No. 56/2016 under Section 220 of the*

Companies Act, 1956, Complaint Case No. 57/2016 under Section 159 of the Companies Act, 1956, Complaint Case No. 02/2018 under Section 137 of the Companies Act, 2013, Complaint Case No. 27/2022 under Section 207(4) of the Companies Act, and Complaint Case No. 50/2024 under Section 454(8) of the Companies Act, 2013, along with all consequential proceedings, cognizance orders, summons, warrants and coercive actions pending before the Court of Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, against the Petitioners, in the interest of justice.

2. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction quashing FIR No. 75/2016 dated 10.11.2016 registered at Police Station Bhoramdev, District Kabirdham (Chhattisgarh) for offences under Sections 420, 406 and 34 IPC, Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Prize Chits and Money Circulation Schemes (Banning) Act, 1978 and Section 10 of the Chhattisgarh Protection of Depositors Interest Act, 2005, qua the present Petitioners, as the continuation of criminal proceedings against innocent commission-based agents amounts to gross abuse of process of law and violation of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

3. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction quashing and setting aside Recovery Order No. RO/214/2022 arising out of Recovery Certificate No. 997/2016 dated 28.01.2022 issued by SEBI against the Petitioners, being *arbitrary, illegal, unconstitutional and passed without determining the actual role, financial benefit, control, or management authority of the Petitioners.*

4. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction declaring that the Petitioners were never "Officers in Default" within the meaning of Section 5 of the Companies Act, 1956 and were never persons "in charge of and responsible for the conduct of business" of M/s Vee Realties India Limited, and therefore cannot be subjected to vicarious criminal or statutory liability merely on the basis of manipulated MCA records.

5. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction directing Respondent Authorities including Registrar of Companies, SEBI and State Investigating Agencies to immediately remove and rectify the names of the Petitioners from records showing them as Directors of M/s Vee Realties India Limited, after conducting proper forensic and legal verification in accordance with law.

6. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction directing constitution of an independent Special Investigation Team (SIT) or transfer investigation to an independent specialized agency for conducting comprehensive, scientific and time-bound investigation into the affairs of M/s Vee Realties India Limited and its interconnected entities namely Vee Real Entertainment House Private Limited, Vee

Insurance Agency Private Limited and Vee Agro Farming & Dairies Private Limited.

7. Direct the Investigating Agency to conduct forensic examination of all statutory filings, DIR forms, consent letters, digital signatures, handwriting samples, MCA uploads, Board Resolutions, ROC records, IP logs, email trails and related documents to ascertain fraudulent appointment and impersonation of the Petitioners as Directors.

8. Direct Respondent Authorities to investigate the role of Mr. Kamlesh Verma, Udaksh Kumar Verma, Ved Prakash Verma, Ganesh Ram Verma and other associates for offences punishable under Sections 316, 318, 319, 336, 337, 338, 340 and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 447, 448 and 449 of the Companies Act, 2013 for fraud, fabrication, false evidence, impersonation, conspiracy, and manipulation of statutory records.

9. Direct the competent authorities to investigate the false affidavits, misleading statements and concealment of material facts made before various Courts, SEBI and the Securities Appellate Tribunal by the actual masterminds while obtaining favourable orders and reliefs.

10. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction directing attachment, freezing and preservation of movable and immovable properties, bank accounts, investments, luxury assets and *interlinked business interests of Mr. Kamlesh Verma and his associates pending investigation, including properties acquired through sale deeds executed on behalf of M/s Vee Realties India Limited even after alleged resignation.*

11. Pass any other order, writ or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, proper and necessary in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case for securing ends of justice, protecting constitutional rights of the Petitioners and restoring faith in the rule of law."

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the criminal proceedings and other consequential proceedings merely on the basis of their names having been reflected as Directors in the records of the Company, whereas, in fact, they were only commission-based field marketing agents and had never exercised any managerial, administrative or financial control over the affairs of Vee Realties India Limited. It is submitted that the petitioners neither participated in any Board meeting nor operated any bank account, signed any statutory document, filed any return, held any shareholding or derived any financial benefit from the affairs of the Company, except the limited commission received for their field-level marketing activities.

4. Learned counsel further submits that the actual affairs and financial operations of the Company were controlled by respondent No.5-Kamlesh Verma and his close associates, who continued to deal with the Company's bank accounts, properties and financial transactions even after their alleged resignation from the directorship. Reliance is placed upon the cheque issued by respondent No.5 in the year 2019 and the registered sale deeds executed by him in the years 2024, representing himself as Director of the Company, to contend that these documents prima facie establish that he continued to exercise effective control over the Company. It is submitted that despite availability of such material, the investigating and statutory authorities have failed to examine the actual beneficiaries and controlling persons and have mechanically proceeded against the present petitioners.

5. It is next submitted that the complaints and criminal proceedings initiated against the petitioners do not contain any specific allegation or material demonstrating that they were in charge of, or responsible for, the conduct of the business of the Company. There is no allegation that the petitioners signed any balance sheet, annual return, statutory filing or Board resolution, operated any bank account or participated in the management of the Company. Mere reflection of their names as Directors in the MCA records, particularly when the petitioners dispute their appointment and allege that their signatures and identity documents were misused, cannot by itself fasten criminal liability upon them. He further submits that the petitioners have placed substantial documentary material demonstrating the alleged misuse of their identities and the continued control exercised by respondent No.5 and his associates, yet no effective or fair investigation has been undertaken.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners, in support of his submissions, places reliance upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sunil Bharti Mittal v. Central Bureau of Investigation, (2015) 4 SCC 609,*** wherein it has been held that criminal liability cannot be fastened upon a Director merely by virtue of his designation and that, in the absence of a specific act attributable to such person coupled with the requisite criminal intent, individual criminal liability cannot ordinarily be imposed. Learned counsel submits that in the present case there is no specific allegation that any of the petitioners participated in the management or conduct of the business of the Company or committed any particular act constituting the alleged offences.

7. Reliance is also placed upon ***S.M.S. Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Neeta Bhalla, (2005) 8 SCC 89,*** to contend that a bald or mechanical assertion that an accused was a Director or was responsible for the conduct of the business of the Company is not sufficient to attract criminal liability. It is necessary to disclose the specific role and responsibility of the person concerned. According to learned counsel, the complaints against the petitioners contain no such specific averment and merely proceed on the basis of their alleged designation in the MCA records, despite the petitioners' categorical case that they never accepted or exercised the office of Director.

8. Learned counsel further places reliance upon ***Harshendra Kumar D. v. Rebatilata Koley, (2011) 3 SCC 351,*** submitting that where unimpeachable documentary material placed before the Court demonstrates that continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of law, the High Court is not precluded from examining such material while exercising its jurisdiction to prevent injustice. It is submitted that in the present case, the cheque issued by respondent No.5 in 2019 and the registered sale deeds executed by him in 2024, representing himself as Director of the Company, constitute significant documentary material demonstrating his continued control over the affairs and assets of the Company.

9. Learned counsel also relies upon ***State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335,*** and submits that the present case falls within the well-recognised categories warranting interference by the High Court, particularly where the allegations, even if taken at their face value, do not disclose the commission of an offence by the accused and where the criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fides or amounts to abuse of the process of law. It is contended that the petitioners have been prosecuted merely because their names were reflected in the MCA records, without any investigation into their actual role, financial control, beneficial interest or participation in the affairs of the Company.

10. Learned counsel further places reliance upon ***Pepsi Foods Ltd. v. Special Judicial Magistrate, (1998) 5 SCC 749,*** to submit that issuance of process against a person has serious consequences and cannot be undertaken mechanically. According to learned counsel, the learned Magistrate failed to apply the requisite judicial mind to the absence of any specific material connecting the petitioners with the alleged offences and mechanically proceeded against them on the basis of their alleged directorship. It is, therefore, submitted that permitting the criminal proceedings to continue against the petitioners, in the face of the aforesaid legal position and the documentary material placed on record, would result in grave injustice and abuse of the process of law.

11. Learned counsel, therefore, submits that even if the allegations contained in the impugned proceedings are taken at their face value, the essential ingredients of the offences are not made out against the petitioners. The continuation of the criminal proceedings, ROC complaints and consequential coercive proceedings against persons who were neither in control of nor beneficiaries of the Company's affairs would cause grave prejudice and irreparable injury to them and accordingly prays for quashment of the impugned proceedings, including order framing charges and all consequential proceedings qua the petitioners.

12. On the other hand, learned Additional Advocate General, appearing for the State, while opposing the petition, submits that the present writ petition, as framed, seeks a multitude of reliefs arising out of distinct proceedings initiated by different statutory and investigating authorities and pending before different forums. It is submitted that the petitioners have sought, in a single proceeding, quashing of several complaint cases under different provisions of the Companies Act, quashing of an FIR registered for offences under the Indian Penal Code and the Prize Chits and Money Circulation Schemes (Banning) Act, as well as the Chhattisgarh Protection of Depositors Interest Act, challenge to the recovery proceedings initiated by SEBI, a declaration regarding their status as "Officers in Default", rectification of MCA records, constitution of an SIT or transfer of investigation to an independent agency, forensic investigation of corporate records, investigation against private individuals for alleged offences under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Companies Act, and even directions for attachment and freezing of the properties and bank accounts of private respondents. Such omnibus and composite reliefs, involving separate causes of action, different statutory regimes, different authorities and proceedings at different stages, cannot appropriately be adjudicated in the present petition in the manner sought by the petitioners.

13. Learned Additional Advocate General further submits that the petitioners have not challenged the individual orders, cognizance orders or proceedings in a specific and properly constituted manner so as to enable the State authorities and the concerned private respondents to effectively meet each of the challenges. It is contended that the prayer for quashing of five distinct complaint cases pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, the prayer for quashing of the FIR, the challenge to the SEBI recovery order, and the prayers seeking investigation, forensic examination and action against private persons stand on entirely different legal and factual foundations. Each such proceeding would require examination of its own pleadings, statutory provisions, evidence, stage of proceedings and orders passed by the competent authority/forum. A sweeping prayer seeking adjudication of all such issues in one writ petition would, therefore, lead to serious procedural and jurisdictional complications and would also prejudice the rights of the respective authorities and affected parties.

14. It is, therefore, submitted that if the petitioners are genuinely aggrieved by any particular complaint case, cognizance order, recovery order or other specific proceeding, they ought to assail the same by filing an appropriately constituted petition, specifically identifying the impugned order/proceeding, the statutory provision involved and the relief sought in respect thereof. Similarly, any grievance relating to rectification of MCA records, SEBI proceedings or the manner of investigation may be pursued before the competent statutory forum in accordance with law.

Learned Additional Advocate General, therefore, submits that the present petition, in its existing omnibus form, is not maintainable and deserves to be dismissed, leaving it open to the petitioners, if so advised, to avail the appropriate remedy by filing separate and properly constituted proceedings in respect of their distinct grievances.

15. We have heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State and have carefully perused the pleadings, documents and other material placed on record. We have also considered the nature of the reliefs sought by the petitioners and the objections raised by the learned State counsel with regard to the maintainability and proper constitution of the present petition.

16. At the outset, it is necessary to observe that the present petition, though styled as a petition invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, seeks determination of a large number of issues arising from proceedings initiated under distinct statutory enactments, before different authorities and at different stages. The petitioners have simultaneously sought quashing of as many as five separate complaint cases pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bilaspur, arising under different provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 and the Companies Act, 2013; quashing of FIR No.75/2016 registered at Police Station Bhoramdev, District

Kabirdham for offences under the Indian Penal Code, the Prize Chits and Money Circulation Schemes (Banning) Act, 1978 and the Chhattisgarh Protection of Depositors Interest Act, 2005; quashing of the SEBI Recovery Order No.RO/214/2022 arising out of Recovery Certificate No.997/2016; a declaration regarding the status of the petitioners as "Officers in Default"; rectification of the MCA records; constitution of an SIT or transfer of investigation to an independent agency; forensic examination of corporate and digital records; investigation against private respondents for alleged offences under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and the Companies Act, 2013; and even directions for attachment, freezing and preservation of properties and bank accounts of private individuals.

17. Thus, the reliefs claimed in the present petition are not merely different facets of one singular cause of action. They arise from separate proceedings, founded upon different statutory provisions, initiated by different authorities and involving different questions of fact and law. The complaint cases pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate stand on a different footing from the FIR registered by the police. Likewise, the SEBI recovery proceedings operate within a distinct statutory framework and are subject to the remedies provided under the securities laws. Similarly, a prayer seeking rectification of the MCA records, a direction for forensic investigation, constitution of an SIT, or attachment of private properties cannot be mechanically clubbed with a prayer for quashing criminal proceedings without examining the statutory source of power, the stage of the proceedings and the remedy available against the particular action complained of.

18. The extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is undoubtedly wide. However, the width of the jurisdiction does not dispense with the requirement that the relief sought must be founded upon a clearly identifiable cause of action and a properly constituted challenge to a particular order or proceeding. The exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction necessarily requires the Court to ascertain the precise nature of the impugned action, the authority which has passed or initiated such action, the statutory provision under which it has been taken, the stage at which the proceeding presently stands and the legal grounds on which such action is assailed. Where multiple independent proceedings are sought to be challenged together, the Court must be particularly cautious so that proceedings arising under different enactments and involving different forums are not examined in an uncertain or omnibus manner.

19. In the present case, the petitioners have not confined the challenge to any one particular order or proceeding. Even in respect of the complaint cases, several independent complaint proceedings have been clubbed together in one prayer, without separately setting out the factual and legal foundation for challenging each individual complaint and the respective cognizance or consequential orders passed therein. The challenge to the FIR is also sought to be considered along with the SEBI recovery proceedings and the complaints under the Companies Act. The petitioners have further sought positive and investigative directions against private persons, including directions for forensic examination, investigation into alleged offences, and attachment and freezing of their properties. Such a wide-ranging prayer would require consideration of several distinct factual controversies and statutory questions which cannot appropriately be adjudicated collectively in the present form of the petition.

20. We are also conscious of the fact that several of the allegations made by the petitioners, particularly those relating to alleged fabrication of documents, forgery of signatures, fraudulent uploading of documents on the MCA portal, continued control of the Company by respondent No.5, operation of bank accounts, execution of sale deeds and alleged suppression of facts before different judicial and statutory forums, are matters which would require examination with reference to the original records and the proceedings in which such allegations arise. The petitioners have relied upon various documents to demonstrate their alleged non-involvement in the affairs of the Company and the alleged continuing role of respondent No.5 and his associates. However, the mere existence of such material, at this stage, cannot enable the Court to adjudicate, in one omnibus writ proceeding, every disputed question arising from separate criminal, regulatory and recovery proceedings.

21. It is equally important to bear in mind that the petitioners seek reliefs against proceedings pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, reliefs against the police investigation, reliefs against SEBI proceedings and directions to statutory authorities such as the Registrar of Companies. Each of these proceedings has its own statutory framework and its own record. The Court exercising writ jurisdiction ought not to undertake a roving or composite examination of all such proceedings merely because the petitioners seek to place them within one broad narrative alleging a common conspiracy. The question whether the ingredients of a particular offence are made out, whether the cognizance taken in a particular complaint suffers from non-application of mind, whether a particular recovery order passed by SEBI is sustainable, whether the petitioners were "Officers in Default", and whether any particular investigation requires further or independent inquiry are distinct questions which may require separate consideration on their own pleadings and records.

22. We may also observe that the petitioners themselves have raised several grievances against different authorities and different orders passed at different points of time. If the petitioners are aggrieved by any particular complaint case, cognizance order, order framing charge, warrant or other consequential proceeding, it would be appropriate for them to place the precise order under challenge before the competent Court and to formulate the grounds specifically referable to that proceeding. Similarly, if the petitioners seek to challenge a particular order passed by SEBI or any other statutory authority, the challenge must be directed against the specific order and examined in the light of the statutory scheme governing such proceeding.

23. The Court is not, at this stage, expressing any opinion on the merits of the allegations made by the petitioners against respondent No.5 or any other private respondent. Likewise, we are not examining or adjudicating upon the petitioners' contention that they were merely commission-based field agents, that their identities or signatures were allegedly misused, or that respondent No.5 continued to exercise control over the Company despite his alleged resignation. These are matters which may be relevant for consideration in an appropriately constituted proceeding where the concerned order, complaint, FIR or statutory action is specifically placed under challenge and the respective respondents are afforded an effective opportunity to meet the allegations.

24. The judgments relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioners, including the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sunil Bharti Mittal*** (supra), ***S.M.S. Pharmaceuticals Ltd.*** (supra), ***Harshendra Kumar D.*** (supra), ***Bhajan Lal*** (supra) and

Pepsi Foods Ltd. (supra), lay down well-settled principles concerning individual criminal liability, the requirement of specific allegations, prevention of abuse of criminal process and the circumstances in which the High Court may exercise its inherent or extraordinary jurisdiction. There can be no quarrel with the propositions of law laid down therein. However, the applicability of those principles to any particular proceeding would necessarily depend upon the pleadings, allegations, statutory provisions and orders forming part of that particular proceeding. The said judgments, therefore, do not obviate the requirement of a properly constituted challenge to the specific proceedings sought to be quashed.

25. The present petition, in its existing form, therefore, suffers from the fundamental difficulty of seeking adjudication upon multiple independent proceedings and a series of distinct reliefs in one composite petition. We are of the considered view that entertaining such an omnibus challenge would neither facilitate an effective adjudication nor enable the respective authorities and private respondents to meet the individual challenges in an appropriate manner. It may also result in the Court examining proceedings which are governed by different statutory remedies and are pending before different authorities or Courts, without the specific orders and complete records necessary for their adjudication.

26. It is clarified that we are not dismissing the present petition on the ground that the petitioners can never invoke the jurisdiction of this Court in respect of any of the grievances raised by them. Rather, the dismissal is necessitated by the manner in which numerous distinct proceedings and reliefs have been combined in the present petition. The petitioners would be at liberty to assail any particular proceeding or order, if otherwise permissible in law, by filing a properly constituted and appropriately framed petition, specifically identifying the impugned order/proceeding, the statutory provision involved, the relevant factual foundation and the precise relief sought therein.

27. Needless to observe, if the petitioners choose to avail such liberty, the concerned Court shall consider the subsequently filed proceeding strictly in accordance with law and on its own merits, without being influenced by any observation made in the present order. All questions relating to the merits of the allegations, the alleged role of the petitioners, the alleged misuse of their identities, the status of the petitioners as Directors or "Officers in Default", the role of respondent No.5 and his associates, the validity of the criminal proceedings, the legality of the SEBI proceedings and the necessity, if any, of further investigation are expressly left open.

28. It is further clarified that we have not expressed any opinion on the truth or otherwise of the allegations made by either side. The petitioners shall be entitled to place all relevant documents and legal submissions before the appropriate forum in the proceedings that may be instituted by them. Likewise, the respondents shall be entitled to raise all permissible objections, including those relating to maintainability, limitation, availability of alternative remedy, delay and laches, statutory jurisdiction and the stage of the proceedings, in accordance with law.

29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, without entering into the merits of the allegations or the individual proceedings sought to be challenged, we are of the considered opinion that the present writ petition, in its omnibus form, is not liable to be entertained. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

30. However, in the interest of justice, liberty is granted to the petitioners to file appropriate and separately constituted proceedings, in accordance with law, for challenging any particular complaint case, cognizance order, order framing charge, FIR, SEBI order or any other specific proceeding or action which they seek to assail, by clearly identifying the impugned order/proceeding and setting out the factual and legal grounds relevant thereto.

31. It is made clear that grant of such liberty shall not be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of any of the proposed challenges, and all contentions of parties are left open to be considered by the appropriate forum in accordance with law.

32. With the aforesaid liberty and observations, the present writ petition stands **dismissed**. There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-	Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)	**(Ramesh Sinha)**
Judge	**Chief Justice**

Anu