



1

WP-16421-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA,  
CHIEF JUSTICE

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VINAY SARAF

ON THE 21<sup>st</sup> OF JULY, 2025

WRIT PETITION No. 16421 of 2025

*TEERTH GOPICON LTD*

*Versus*

*MADHYA PRADESH JAL NIGAM AND OTHERS*

.....  
Appearance:

Shri Arihant Kumar Nahar, Advocate for petitioner.

Shri Siddharth Sharma, Advocate for respondent/Caveator.

Shri Pawan Singh, Advocate on behalf of Shri Vikram Singh,

Advocate for CBI.

.....  
WITH

WRIT PETITION No. 16423 of 2025

*TEERTH GOPICON LIMITED*

*Versus*

*MADHYA PRADESH JAL NIGAM AND OTHERS*

.....  
Appearance:

Shri Arihant Kumar Nahar, Advocate for petitioner.

Shri Siddharth Sharma, Advocate for respondent/Caveator.

Shri Pawan Singh, Advocate on behalf of Shri Vikram Singh, Advocate for  
CBI.

.....  
WRIT PETITION No. 16425 of 2025

*TEERTH GOPICON LIMITED*

*Versus****THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS***

---

**Appearance:**

Shri Arihant Kumar Nahar, Advocate for petitioner.

Shri Siddharth Sharma, Advocate for respondent/Caveator.

Shri Pawan Singh, Advocate on behalf of Shri Vikram Singh, Advocate for  
CBI.

---

**ORDER**

***Per. Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjeev Sachdeva, Chief Justice***

Petitioner had approached this court seeking an interdict on the respondents whereby respondent had issued termination notices proposing to cancel the contracts awarded to the petitioner. Subject notices were issued on the ground that the bank guarantees submitted by the petitioner in furtherance to the tender documents were found to be forged. This court, on 05.05.2025 while granting an opportunity to the petitioner to furnish fresh bank guarantees within 30 days also directed the Central Bureau of Investigation at Bhopal to look into the issue of forged bank guarantees and to take further steps. On 30th June 2025, status report had been produced on behalf of the Central Bureau of Investigation in a sealed cover. Perusal of the sealed cover had shown that F.I.R. has been registered and the investigation was still on. The status report was thereafter directed to be kept in a sealed cover and registry was directed not to open the sealed cover without the leave of the court. Learned counsel appearing for the CBI submits that the investigation is still underway.

2. Learned counsel for petitioner further contends that subsequently respondent has now terminated the contract and accordingly, petitioner



intends to amend the petitions.

3. A preliminary objection is raised by learned Counsel appearing for the respondent, who submits that the contract provides for an alternative dispute resolution mechanism under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996, and the remedy of the petitioner, if any, is under the said Act.

4. Faced with the objection, learned Counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the petitions reserving the right of the petitioner to initiate proceedings under the alternative dispute redressal mechanism provided in the contract. He further submits that withdrawal of the petitions should be without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the petitioner and the defense of the petitioner in the criminal investigation.

5. In view of the above, the petitions are dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to invoke the alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

6. It is clarified that this order would be without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties and also without prejudice to the defense if any of the petitioner in the criminal investigation pending before the Central Bureau of Investigation. The Central Bureau of Investigation shall conclude the investigation expeditiously in accordance with law and take the same to its logical conclusion.

7. The petitions accordingly disposed of in the above terms.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)  
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VINAY SARAF)  
JUDGE



MSP

4

WP-16421-2025