

**HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH : JABALPUR
LARGER BENCH - I (Time 2:30 PM)**

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

**BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN**

Court Hall No.: 1

NOTE:- All the Advocates are requested to submit a list of cases, in which compromise/amicable settlement is possible in the forthcoming permanent & continuous Lok Adalat. The list of cases may be submitted in the office of M.P. High Court Legal Services Committee, Jabalpur or may also be sent through email mphclsc@gmail.com,sechclscjbp@mp.gov.in at the earliest.

In compliance of Court order dated 28.05.2024 passed in CRA 10947/2019 (Ram Singh Vs State of MP), it is to inform that Counsels cannot appear in Criminal Appeals on the basis of memo of appearance and they will have to necessarily file Vakalatnama. They may do so during the vacation, failing which, after vacation Hon'ble Court may not entertain appearance on the memo of appearance

MOTION HEARING

[DIRECTION MATTERS]

SN	Case No	Petitioner / Respondent	Petitioner/Respondent Advocate
1	WP 17858/2020	SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKAT) ORGANIZATION Versus THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH	SUSHANT TIWARI SANKALP SHARMA[P-1] ADVOCATE GENERAL
	Transfer From Gwalior Bench	CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Municipal and Local Bodies {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ? 01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION	
1.1	Linked WP 00693/2018	THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH Anr. Versus CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA	& KARAMJEET SINGH WADHWA GURDEEP SINGH WADHWA & Ors. SHRI ARVIND PANDEY[R-1], ARUN KUMAR PANDEY[R-2], ABHIJIT CHAKRABARTI THAKUR[R-1], ARNA CHATTERJEE[R-1], AVANEESH KUMAR YADAV[R-1][R-2] [R-2][R-2][R-3][R-3][R-3][R-3], NAMAN KUMAR UPADHYAY[R-1], ANAND BHUBAN SAHU[R-1], KAPIL DUGGAL[R-1][R-2][R-2][R-2]
		CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 Relief - TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED COMMUNICATION DT.09/05/2012(ANN.P-1) {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} [LISTED WITH WP 17858/2020] FOR ADMISSION. [NOTE:-CASE IS DELINKED FROM WP 10739/2017[BUNCH OF 14 CASES] 01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION	
1.2	Connected WP 10286/2020	RAMKISHOR GUPTA Versus THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH	PRASHANT SHARMA SEETARAM KUSHWAH, PRASHANT SINGH KAURAV & Ors. ADVOCATE GENERAL AJAY KUMAR CHATURVEDI[R-2], SANKALP SHARMA[R-2], DEEPAK KHOT[R-3], NAKUL KHEDKAR[R-3]
	Transfer From Gwalior Bench	CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 Relief - TO QUASH AND SET ASIDE ANNEX. P/-1. {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN	

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN

LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

1.3 **Connected**
WP
20836/2022

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA
(LOKAYUKT) MP. BHOPAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Anr.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - QUASH THE ORDER DATED 16/08/2021

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION**

1.4 **Linked**
WP
18071/2020

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SUSHANT TIWARI SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
LOKAYUKT ORGANIZATION

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL TRILOK CHANDRA BANSAL[R-2], RAHUL AGRAWAL[R-2], RAJMANI BANSAL[R-2], SUBHENDRA SINGH[R-2], BRIJENDRA SINGH[R-2][R-3] [R-3][R-3][R-3][R-4][R-4][R-4][R-4], RINKU RATHOUR[R-5][R-5][R-5][R-5], RAJEEV JAIN[R-6], PRASUM KUMAR MAHESHWRI[R-6], AMIT SINGH THAKUR[R-5], RAVI UPADHYAY[R-5], ASHLEY JOHNMATHEW[R-5], TANVI KHARE[R-5], PRIYANK AGRAWAL[R-5], MANISHA KHARE[R-5], ALOK NARAYAN PATHAK[R-5]

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - PETITION KINDLY BE ALLOWED AND QUASH THE ANN P/1 AND FOR DIRECTION

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

**BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN**

01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

-
- 1.5 **Linked WP 17982/2020** SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAHYUKAT) ORGANIZATION MP SUSHANT TIWARI SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
- Versus
- THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH ADVOCATE GENERAL
- CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 Relief - PETITION MAY KINDLY BE ALLOWED AND THE ORDER ANNEXURES ANN P/1 KINDLY BE QUASHED {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION
- Transfer From Gwalior Bench**
-
- 1.6 **Connected WP 19275/2022** SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT(LOKAYUKTA) ORGANIZATION MADHYA PRADESH BHOPAL SANKALP SHARMA
- Versus
- THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL
- Anr.**
- CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 Relief - PETITION KINDLY BE ALLOWED AND QUASHED THE ORDER DATED 29/10/2021 AND FOR DIRECTION {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION
- Transfer From Gwalior Bench**
-
- 1.7 **Linked WP 27398/2023** THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT LOKAYUKTA ORGANIZATION OF MADHYA PRADESH SANKALP SHARMA
- Versus
- THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL
- Ors.**
- CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1947-12001 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1947-12001 Relief - PETITION MAY KINDLY BE ALLOW AND QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING**
- Transfer From Gwalior Bench**

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN

OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

1.8 **Linked**
WP
14358/2022

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA
(LOKAYUKT) MADHYA PRADESH
BHOPAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Ors.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - QUASH THE ORDER DT.17/03/2021 (ANN.P-1) AND DIRECTION TO GIVEN TO THE RESPONDENT TO GIVE PERMISSION/SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

1.9 **Linked**
WP
14361/2022

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA
LOKAYUKT M P BHOPAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Anr.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - QUASH THE ORDER DT.16/08/2021 (ANN.P-1)

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

1.10 **Connected**
WP
19544/2020

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SUSHANT TIWARI SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
(LOKAYUKT) ORGANIZATION

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Ors.

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - TO QUASH AND SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 30.01.2020 (ANNEXURE P/1)

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

**Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench**

1.11 **Linked**
WP
12424/2021

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SUSHANT TIWARI SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
(LAKAYUKT) ORGANIZATION MP

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Anr.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - TO QUASH ANN P/1 AND REMAND THE MATTER FOR GRANT OF SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

**Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench**

1.12 **Connected**
WP
30016/2022

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA
(LOKAYUKTA)

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Anr.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - PETITION KINDLY BE ALLOWED AND QUASH THE ANNEX P-1 FOR DIRECTION

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**

**Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench**

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

**BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN**

01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

1.13 **Linked**
WP
30033/2022

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA
(LOKAYUKTA) ORGANIZATION THR.

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Anr.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1947-12001 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1947-12001
Relief - PETITION KINDLY BE ALLOWED AND QUASH THE ANNEX P-1 FOR DIRECTION

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

1.14 **Linked**
WP
12654/2021

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SUSHANT TIWARI SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
(LOKAYUKT) ORGANIZATION

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL YOGENDRA TIWARI[R-2], ASHOK
KUMAR SHAH[R-2]

Anr.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - PETITION KINDLY BE ALLOWED AND QUASHED THE ANNE P/1 AND FOR DIRECTION

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

1.15 **Linked**
WP
25310/2022

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Anr.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - TO QUASH ANN P/1 AND REMAND THE MATTER FOR GRANT OF SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING**

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN

OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

1.16 **Linked**
WP
19877/2021

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SUSHANT TIWARI SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
(LOKAYUKAT) THR.

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH ADVOCATE GENERAL ADVOCATE GENERAL[R-1][AG]

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - FOR QUASH ANNE P/1 WITH DIRECTION TO GRANT SANCTION

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

1.17 **Linked**
WP
18237/2022

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA
(LOKAYUKTA) ORGANIZATION
MADHYA PRADESH BHOPAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Anr.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - TO QUASH ANN P/1 AND REMAND THE MATTER FOR GRANT OF SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

1.18 **Connected**
WP
24871/2021

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SUSHANT TIWARI SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
(LOKAYUKT) ORGANIZATION THR.

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Anr.

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - ANNEXURE P/1 MAY KINDLY BE QUASHED

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

**Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench**

1.19 **Connected
WP
19362/2022**

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SANKALP SHARMA
LOKAYUKTA OF MADHYA PRADESH

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Ors.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - SETTING ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 27/01/2020, 17/09/2021

**Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench**

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

1.20 **Connected
WP
30349/2024**

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
(LOKAYUKTA) ORGANIZATION
MADHYA PRADESH BHOPAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Ors.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - FOR QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER ANNEX.P/1

**Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench**

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

**BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN**

01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

1.21 **Connected**
WP
30346/2024

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
(LOKAYUKTA) ORGANIZATION
MADHYA PRADESH BHOPAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Ors.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1988-12002
Relief - TO QUASH AND SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 09.01.2024 (ANNEXURE P/1)
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

1.22 **Linked**
WP
30359/2024

SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT SANKALP SHARMA SANKALP SHARMA[P-1]
(LOKAYUKTA) ORGANIZATION
MADHYA PRADESH BHOPAL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Ors.

CORRUPTION-12000 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1947-12001 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1947-12001
Relief - PETITION MAY KINDLY BE ALLOWED AND QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER ANNEX P-1
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **QUESTIONS FOR REFERENCE ARE AS UNDER: (1) WHETHER SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKTA) HAS ANY AUTHORITY/ JURISDICTION/ COMPETENCE TO CHALLENGE THE ORDER OF REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT (OR ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT) IN RESPECT OF AN ALLEGATION MADE AGAINST ANY DELINQUENT PUBLIC SERVANT OR NOT ? (2) WHEN LEGISLATIVE INTENT OF THE LOKAYUKT EVAM UP- LOKAYUKT ADHINIYAM, 1981 WAS TO LOOK INTO AN ALLEGATION AGAINST PUBLIC SERVANT AND TO CHECK BREEDING OF CORRUPTION AMONGST THE PUBLIC SERVANTS THEN WHETHER IT GIVES MANDATES TO THE SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) TO CHALLENGE REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION OR WHETHER THE ROLE OF SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) IS CONFINED ONLY TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER AND SUBMIT INVESTIGATION REPORT AND NOT BEYOND THAT ? (3) WHETHER M.P. LOKAYUKT EVAM UP-LOKAYUKT, ADHINIYAM 1981 AND SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT ACT, 1947, IF ARE SEEN IN JUXTAPOSITION THEN IT GIVES AN IMPRESSION THAT SPECIAL POLICE ESTABLISHMENT (LOKAYUKT) CAN INVESTIGATE THE MATTER AND BRING THE CASE TO ITS LOGICAL END WHICH INCLUDES CHALLENGE TO REFUSAL TO GRANT SANCTION FOR PROSECUTION ?**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION

Transfer From
Gwalior
Bench

2 **WP**
11356/2024

RAMLAL JHARIYA JAYANT NEEKHRA SANJEEV NEEKHRA

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL

Ors.

CUSTOM & EXCISE-12200 - M.P. Excise Act, 1915-12220 - M.P. Excise Act, 1915-12220
Relief - TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 14.08.2023 (ANNEXURE P/1)
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **15. IN THE VIEW OF THIS COURT, FOLLOWING QUESTIONS EMERGE FOR DECISION:- (A) WHETHER, ANY ARTICLES OR VEHICLES CAN BE CONFISCATED UNDER SECTION 47(A) OF THE M.P. EXCISE ACT, 1915 DURING THE PENDENCY OF CRIMINAL TRIAL INITIATED AGAINST THE OFFENDERS BEFORE THE JUDICIAL COURTS? (B) WHETHER, THE DICTUM LAID DOWN BY THE APEX COURT IN THE MATTER OF MADHUKAR RAO VS. STATE OF M.P., (2008) 14 SCC 624 IS APPLICABLE TO THE CASES REGISTERED UNDER SECTION 34(2) AND THE CONFISCATION PROCEEDINGS UNDER SECTION 47(A) OF THE ACT, 1915? (C) WHETHER, THE CONFISCATION PROCEEDINGS CAN GO ON PARALLEL TO THE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS**

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

**BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN**

**AND COLLECTOR CAN PASS THE ORDER OF CONFISCATION IRRESPECTIVE TO THE PENDING OF CRIMINAL CASE? (D) WHETHER, THE COORDINATE BENCHES WERE JUSTIFIED IN DELIVERING THE CONFLICTING VIEWS WITHOUT REFERRING THE MATTER UNDER CHAPTER IV RULE 8(3) OF THE HIGH COURT RULES, 2008 AND THE CONFLICTING VIEW IN THE ABSENCE OF ANY REFERENCE CAN BE CONSIDERED AS BINDING PRECEDENT, IN VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE OF STARE DECISIS? (E) WHETHER, WRIT PETITION CAN BE ENTERTAINED AGAINST THE ORDER OF CONFISCATION, IN VIEW OF JUDGMENT OF APEX COURT IN THE MATTER OF WHIRLPOOL CORPORATION VS. REGISTRAR OF TRADE MARKS, (1998) 8 SCC 1 AND JUDGMENT OF DIVISION BENCH OF THIS COURT IN THE MATTER OF ALOK KUMAR CHOUBEY VS. STATE OF M.P., (2021) 1 MPLJ 348, ON THE GROUND THAT COLLECTOR HAD NO AUTHORITY TO PASS ANY ORDER OF CONFISCATION DURING THE PENDING OF CRIMINAL CASE?
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION**

-
- 2.1** **Linked**
MCRC
06762/2024
- ASHIF IQBAL KHAN ANUJ AGARWAL SHASHANK SHRIVASTAVA, NEERAJ KUMAR SHARMA
- Versus
- THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL
- Ors.**
- CrPC - S. 482, Excise Act - S. 34(2)/42,
CRIMINAL LAW & PROCEDURE-12100 - Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973-12102 - SECTION 482.
Relief - TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER.
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FOR ADMISSION**
-
- 2.2** **Linked**
WP
18164/2024
- BHISHM SINGH THAKUR VIJAY SHUKLA SHAILENDRA SINGH RAJPUT, ALOK KUMAR GUPTA[P-1], VIVEK RANJAN PANDEY[P-1]
- Versus
- THE EXCISE COMMISSIONER ADVOCATE GENERAL ADVOCATE GENERAL[R-1][AG][R-2]
MADHYA PRADESH GWALIOR & [AG]
- Anr.**
- CUSTOM & EXCISE-12200 - M.P. Excise Act, 1915-12220 - M.P. Excise Act, 1915-12220
Relief - TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 09.05.2024 (ANNEXURE P/10)
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FIXED FOR ORDERS. TO BE LINKED WITH WP NO. 11350/2024 LISTED BEFORE FULL BENCH. AS BOTH CASE ARE INDENTICLE MATTERS AND PETITIONER WISH TO ADDRESS THE HON'BLE FULL BENCH (NOTE: RETURN FILED BY RES. NO. 1 AND 2) (NOTE: IN VIEW OF MENTION MEMO DTD. 13.02.2025 FOR LISTING ALONGWITH WP 11356/2024 BEFORE LARGER BENCH)**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION
-
- 2.3** **Linked**
WP
18492/2024
Adjustment (a)
- SANJAY YADAV SHIVAM MISHRA ABHINAV SHRIVASTAVA, PRIYANSHU DUBEY, CHANDRA PRAKASH KUSHWAHA
- Versus
- THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL ADVOCATE GENERAL[R-1][AG][R-3]
Ors. [AG]
- CUSTOM & EXCISE-12200 - M.P. Excise Act, 1915-12220 - M.P. Excise Act, 1915-12220
When one party is court or Judicial Officer - DISTRICT COURT - DISTRICT COURT
Relief - SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 05/08/2022, 18/096/2023, 23/03/2024
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FOR NON COMPLIANCE OF HON'BLE C.O.DT- 24/07/2024, COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT AMENDED MEMO OF PARTIES NOT FILED TILL YET. RESPONDENT NO.02 HAS BEEN DELETED BY HON.C.O. DT 24/07/2024 WHICH WAS JUDICIAL PARTY.THEREFORE THIS CASE IS TO BE LISTED BEFORE SINGLE BENCH.**
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION
- ADJUSTMENT NOTE**
ABHINAV SHRIVASTAVA 24-02-2025 TO 13-03-2025
-
- 2.4** **Linked**
MCRC
35204/2024
- SATISH JAISWAL RAHUL KUMAR TRIPATHI SUNIL KUMAR MISHRA
- Versus
- THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH ADVOCATE GENERAL
- Excise Act - S. 34(2), BHARTIYA NAGRIK SURAKSHA SANHITA - S. 528,
CRIMINAL LAW & PROCEDURE-12100 - THE BHARATIYA NAGARIK SURAKSHA SANHITA 2023-12107 - SECTION 528.
Relief - TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 30.07.2024
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FOR ADMISSION**
-
- 2.5** **Linked**
MCRC
37906/2024
- DHARMENDRA KUMAR TOMAR ALOK KUMAR DWIVEDI DHIRESH SINGH DUBEY, UMESH KUMAR NEEKHAR, CHANDRA PRAKASH PATEL
- Versus
- THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH ADVOCATE GENERAL

Daily Cause List dated : 06-03-2025

**BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN**

CrPC - S. 482, Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act - S. 8/21/22,
CRIMINAL LAW & PROCEDURE-12100 - Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973-12102 - SECTION 482.
Relief - TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 30.05.2024.

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FOR ADMISSION AND IA NO.22247/2024-
APPLICATION FOR GRANT OF INTERIM SUPERDNAMA OF DESIRE CAR TILL THE
PENDENCY OF PETITION**

2.6	Linked WA 02763/2024	SMT. JYOTI CHAKRAWARTY	DURGESH KUMAR SINGRORE SANDESH DIXIT, KAPIL SINGH CHANDEL
Versus			
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL			
Anr.			
WP 32024/2024- DURGESH KUMAR SINGRORE,SANDESH DIXIT,KAPIL SINGH CHANDEL,RAHUL SINGH RAJPUT			
CUSTOM & EXCISE-12200 - M.P. Excise Act, 1915-12220 - M.P. Excise Act, 1915-12220 Relief - SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 25/10/2024			
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} FOR ADMISSION WRIT APPEAL U/S 2(1) OF THE MADHYA PRADESH UCCHA NYAYALAYA ADHINIYAM 2005			
2.7	Linked WP 06542/2025	RAJESH	VIVEK RANJAN PANDEY ALOK KUMAR GUPTA
Versus			
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL			
Anr.			
ULTRA VIRES CASES-20200 - ULTRA VIRES CASES-20200 - ULTRA VIRES CASES-20200 Relief - MAY BE FREE TO CONSIDER THE APPLICATION OF RELEASE OF AFORESAID VEHICLE			
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} FOR ADMISSION AND I.R., THIS CASE CONNECTED WITH WP 11356/2024.			
3	WP 23359/2024 (CR)	CHE TAN	AKHIL GODHA NIKHIL KUMAR GODHA, ABHILASHA JAIN, KARAN KACHHWAHA
Versus			
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ADVOCATE GENERAL ADVOCATE GENERAL[R-2]			
Ors.			
CRIMINAL LAW & PROCEDURE-12100 - Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973-12102 - Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973-12102			
{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} FOR CONSIDERING FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:- (1) WHETHER IN VIEW OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT IN CASES OF ABDUL VAHAB (SUPRA) (IN PARTICULAR PARA - 21 AS QUOTED ABOVE) AND KALLO BAI (SUPRA), THE CONFISCATION PROCEEDINGS UNDER SECTION 11(5) OF THE ADHINIYAM, 2004 AND RULE 5 OF RULES, 2012 CAN BE INITIATED AND PROSECUTED SIMULTANEOUSLY WITH THE CRIMINAL TRIAL BEFORE THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS FOR THE OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTION 9 OF THE ADHINIYAM, 2010 ? (2) WHETHER THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE CAN ADJUDICATE VIOLATION OF SECTION(S) 4, 5, 6, 6A AND 6B OF THE ADHINIYAM, 2004 BEFORE CONCLUSION OF TRIAL BY THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE FOR OFFENCE PUNISHABLE UNDER SECTION 9 OF THE ADHINIYAM, 2004 ? (3) WHETHER THE WRIT PETITION CAN BE ENTERTAINED AGAINST THE CONFISCATION ORDER PASSED BY THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE UNDER SECTION 11(5) OF THE ADHINIYAM, 2004 DESPITE AVAILABILITY OF EQUALLY EFFICACIOUS ALTERNATE RELIEF OF APPEAL UNDER SECTION 11A OF THE ADHINIYAM AND REVISION UNDER SECTION 11B OF THE ADHINIYAM, 2004 ON THE GROUND THAT THE COLLECTOR CANNOT DECIDE THE VIOLATION OF SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 6A AND 6B OF THE ADHINIYAM, 2004, UNTIL DECISION OF THE CRIMINAL COURT AFTER TRIAL FOR CONTRAVENTION OF AFORESAID SECTIONS?			
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION			

**Transfer From
Indore Bench**

TOTAL CASES : 32 (with connected matters)

PR (J) / R (J-I) / R(J-II)