



\$~117

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 3588/2026**

Date of decision: **19.03.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

KISHAN PAL SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Bishwajit Singh and Mr. Prakhar
Aditya, Advocates.

versus

SEBI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ashish aggarwal Mr. Himanshu
Singh, Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Vikrant Pachnanda, and Mr.
Mukul Katyal, Advocates for R-2.
Mr. Vikrant Nilesh Goyal, Ms.
Laavanya Kaushik, Mr. Yash Basoya,
Mr. Kunal Dixit, Advocates for R-
UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition is for the following reliefs:-

“a. Issue the writ Mandamus directing respondent no 1 to consolidate all the matters pertains to the petitioners and come to the common findings with respect to the status of petitioners. Certiorari and other writs which Hon’ble Court deems fit.

b. Issue the writ Mandamus directing respondent no 2 to conduct investigation with respect to the affairs of respondent no 5 who has indulged in scam in thousands of crore and monitor the investigation till



the culprit is brought to books , Certiorari and other writs which Hon'ble Court deems fit

c. Issue the writ Mandamus directing respondent no 3 to investigate as to how the petitioners came to be made directors despite there giving no consent and to keep the directorship of the petitioners at hold till the investigation is complete by respondent no 2 . Certiorari and other writs which Hon'ble Court deems fit.

d. Pass order/or orders as may be deemed fit in the facts and circumstances of present writ petition."

2. The petitioners were employees of respondent no. 4 namely En Aromatic and Petro Chemical Ltd. (**'Company'**) and were allegedly fraudulently made its directors without their consent by respondent no. 5 namely Mukesh Kumar Khare, who is the actual director of company. The company raised a vast amount of money from investors and did not pay them back. Thereafter, various investors filed a complaint before the Serious Fraud Investigation Office ('SFIO'), and the same was forwarded to Securities and Exchange Board of India ('SEBI').

3. The petitioners thereafter made representations to SEBI, Central Bureau of Investigation ('CBI') and Ministry of Corporate Affairs ('MCA') i.e. respondents nos. 1, 2, and 3 herein. However, no investigation has been initiated by the said authorities. *Per contra*, the petitioners are suffering criminal prosecution for the fraudulent acts of the company. The petitioners contend that they were not the actual directors of the company and their documents were misused by the company. The petitioners, therefore, submit that they are not even aware as to in how many companies the petitioners have been shown as directors. They, therefore, contend that all those aspects can be looked into by the SEBI and CBI.

4. The Court, however, finds that the nature of relief sought in the instant petition may not be amenable to be granted.



2026:DHC:2537



5. So far as the submission with respect to the misuse of the documents of the petitioners is concerned, the Court arrives at a conclusive finding that the same will require oral and documentary evidence to be produced before the concerned authority. The petitioners, therefore, will have to take any other alternate remedy in which jurisdiction such a prayer can be granted.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petition stands disposed of.
7. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

MARCH 19, 2026

Nc