



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SURESH KUMAR KAIT,
CHIEF JUSTICE

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK JAIN

ON THE 13th OF MAY, 2025

REVIEW PETITION No. 799 of 2025

HIMANSHU SHRIVASTAVA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

WITH

REVIEW PETITION No. 800 of 2025

HIMANSHU SHRIVASTAVA AND OTHERS

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....
Appearance:

*Shri Sanjay Agrawal- Senior Advocate with Shri Arpit Agrawal-
Advocate for the petitioner.*

*Shri Bramhadatt Singh- Deputy Advocate General for the respondent-
State.*

Shri Anshuman Singh - Advocate for the respondent No. 6.
.....

ORDER

Per. Hon'ble Shri Justice Suresh Kumar Kait, Chief Justice

The present matter is of some importance and in Writ Appeal No. 1274/2025 vide order dated 30-04-2025 it is observed that Vide order dated 09.10.2024 IG (Police) directed the I.O. not to take any action till the report from the S.P. QD is received. Accordingly, vide order dated 28.04.2025, this Court directed the State to produce the report of S.P. (Questioned



Documents), if prepared. Consequently the report had been produced, wherein it was mentioned that until original documents are furnished, the report cannot be given on the questioned documents. This Court also observed that undisputedly initially the petitioners moved anticipatory bail application before the Sessions Court the same was rejected upto the High Court and thereafter they tried their luck before the Supreme Court. Regarding the issue that AGM has been stayed by the writ Court without impleading the company, it is the dispute in the present case that the respondent herein had whether resigned or not from the company and their stand was that they never resigned and it was forged resignation placed before the ROC and because of the said action taken by the appellants and their associates, they had to file the FIR which is pending investigation. In that situation when the respondent cannot participate in the AGM, the writ court has rightly directed not to call the AGM until further order. Accordingly, the writ appeal was disposed of.

2. Thereafter, present review petition was filed and vide order dated 08.05.2025 we observed that there is no ground to review the order dated 30th April-2025, however, liberty is granted to the Review Petitioners as undertaken by learned counsel for the petitioners that they shall furnish original papers as required by Superintendent of Police (Q.D.) in a sealed cover on the next date of hearing before this Court. Consequently, there are six documents that have been produced in the sealed cover and after opening the same we find that only relevant original document is D/1 which is communication dated 23rd June 2023 whereby Mr. Harneet Singh Lamba,



the then Director allegedly resigned and his signatures are in original which has been accepted by the Board of Directors.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the said signatures are forged he never resigned from the company in question, whereas learned counsel for review petitioner drawn the attention of this Court to the statement of Harmeet Singh Lamba which is Annexure P/2 of I.A. No. 10095/2025 whereby it is stated before the police station Madhav Nagar District Katni from 05-06-2018 to 11-07-2023 he was working as a Director but thereafter till date he is not working with the said company. The said statement is dated 22-11-2023.

4. Accordingly, the documents which have been supplied in sealed cover are handed over to Shri Bramhadatt Singh- Deputy Advocate General who is present before this Court and is directed to get sent the document D/1 and Annexure P/2 (alleged statement of Harmeet Singh Lamba at police station Madhav Nagar, District Katni) after taking from the said police station send to the S.P. (QD) Bhopal. It is made clear that the original shall be handed over by the said police station to S.P. (QD) and in that situation S.P. (QD) Bhopal is directed to prepare the report after verification of the documents D/1 which is original one with the admitted signature i.e. bank account etc. and thereafter file report before the D.G.P. The present order is passed only for the interest of justice just to know about whether Harmeet Singh Lamba and Surendra Singh Saluja may be have actually resigned from the company or their resignation is based upon the forged signatures.

5. S.P. Katni is directed to arrange to get original resignation



wherein original signature are appended in addition to 27-06-2023 to be sent to SP QD.

6. Counsel for the petitioner herein has alleged that the S.P. Katni is influencing the investigation, therefore, we direct the DGP to look into it personally and if required assign the investigation to some other independent agency.

7. As submitted by learned counsel for respondent No. 6 that original documents of Surendra Singh Saluja have not been furnished and learned counsel for petitioner submits that he had sent original on the WhatsApp. Regarding the resignation of Mr. Saluja it will be taken accordingly into consideration by the investigating agency after the report of Harmeet Singh Lama.

8. With the aforesaid both the review petitions are disposed of.

(SURESH KUMAR KAIT)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VIVEK JAIN)
JUDGE

MISHRA