



2026:DHC:3157



§~66

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

Date of Decision: 16.04.2026+ **CRL.M.C. 2849/2026, CRL.M.A. 11588/2026, CRL.M.A. 11589/2026 & CRL.M.A. 11587/2026**

SALLAHUDDIN ZEINNUDDIN SHEIKHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Trideep Pais, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Akshat Gupta, Advocate (*both
through videoconferencing*).

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENTRespondent

Through: Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Panel Counsel
with Mr. Kanishk Maurya and Mr.
Ch. Abhinandan Patra, Advocates.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

1. Petitioner, facing trial for offence under Section 3 and 4 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act has assailed order dated 27.02.2026 of the learned trial court whereby his application under Section 230/231 BNSS for supply of hardcopy or digital copy of the Relied Upon Documents (RUD-44 and RUD-45) was dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for Directorate of Enforcement appearing on advance intimation accepts notice and submits that it is only a part of RUD-44 and



2026:DHC:3157



RUD-45 that has been relied upon by the Directorate of Enforcement for the purposes of framing charge and those relied upon portions have already been supplied to the petitioner. It is further submitted by learned counsel for Directorate of Enforcement that in case at some subsequent stage, some additional material from RUD-44 and RUD-45 is to be used against the petitioner, at that stage that material also would be supplied.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner contends that his right to fair trial would get vitiated if the remaining portion of RUD-44 and RUD-45 is concealed from him. For, the said portion would be vital for his defence.

4. After some discussion, on instructions, learned counsel for Directorate of Enforcement submits that only in the interest of expeditious disposal of the trial, the Directorate of Enforcement is agreeable to supply complete RUD-44 and complete RUD-45 to the petitioner but it shall be the prerogative of the learned trial court to permit or not permit the petitioner to use the remaining portions of RUD-44 and RUD-45 for the purposes of framing charge.

5. Accordingly, with consent of both sides, this petition is allowed, thereby setting aside the impugned order and directing the Directorate of Enforcement to supply the complete RUD-44 and complete RUD-45 to the petitioner on the date already fixed before the trial court (18.04.2026).

6. However, learned counsel for both sides also are agreeable that the



2026:DHC:3157



trial court may examine as to whether for supply of the data of RUD-44 pertaining to the co-accused, the consent of the co-accused would be required in order to ensure his privacy.

7. Accompanying applications also stand disposed of.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

APRIL 16, 2026/dr