$~95

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010454242026**

\+ **W.P.(C) 13998/2026 & CM APPL. 65455/2026, CM APPL. 65456/2026**

M/S CHAUBARA EATS PVT. LTD .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mukesh M. Goel & Mr. Sagar Sharma, Advocates

versus

SEBI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Pratap Venugopal, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Ashish Raghuvanshi, Mr. Anshit Aggarwal, Mr. Soutriky Chakravarty, Mr. Ishan Agrawal, Mr. Ashutosh Mishra & Mr. Gandharv Garg, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

O R D E R

% 23.09.2026

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 16.09.2026 (hereafter '**impugned order**'), passed by the Securities and Exchange Board of India ('**SEBI**'), thereby passing certain interim directions which are reproduced below:

> *221. "In view of the foregoing, in order to protect the interest of the investors and the integrity of the securities market, I, in exercise of the powers conferred upon me in terms of section 19 read with sections 11(1), 11(4) and 11B of the SEBI Act, 1992, hereby issue the following directions:*
>
> *i. The bank accounts of Noticees are impounded jointly and severally to the extent of amount as mentioned in the table below, and they are directed to open fixed deposit account(s) in their names so as to credit or deposit the aforesaid impounding amount as per the*

following table with a lien marked in favour of SEBI and the amount kept therein shall not be released without permission from SEBI;

Table 48

[redacted]		
1	*Prsaar Sampada Private Limited*	*22,06,44,706*
2	*Ved Prakash Gupta*	
3	*Priti Gupta*	
4	*Chaubara Eats Private Limited*	*6,05,63,836*
5	*Saroj Gupta*	
6	*Gaurav Tomar*	
[redacted]		

(In case of the Noticee No. 1, this direction applies to its proprietary bank account only)

ii. *Noticee Nos. 1 to 6 shall be restrained from accessing the securities markets (In case of the Noticee No. 1, this direction applies to its proprietary trading account only);*

iii. *Banks, where Noticees are holding bank accounts, are directed that no debits shall be made, without permission of SEBI, in respect of the bank accounts held by Noticees, except for the purposes of transfer of funds to the fixed deposit account(s) as stipulated above. Further, this direction shall not apply to those bank accounts of Noticee No. 1 which deal with clients' funds, since Noticee No. 1 is a stock broker registered with SEBI and deals with funds of clients;*

iv. *Depositories shall also be directed that no debit shall be made, without permission of SEBI, in respect of the demat accounts held by Noticees (In case of the Noticee No. 1 this direction applies to its proprietary account only). However, credits, if any, into the accounts may be allowed;*

v. *Banks and Depositories are directed to ensure that all the aforesaid directions are strictly enforced. Further, debits in the bank accounts may also be allowed for amounts available in the account in excess of the amount to be impounded. Banks are allowed to debit* *the accounts for the purpose of complying with this Order;*

vi. The Registrar and Transfer Agents shall ensure that, they neither permit any transfer nor redemption of securities, including Mutual Funds units, held by Noticees;

vii. Noticees shall not dispose of or alienate any of their assets/properties, except with the prior permission of SEBI;

viii. Noticees are further directed to provide a full inventory of all their assets whether movable or immovable, or any interest or investment or charge in any of such assets, including property, details of all their bank accounts, demat accounts, holdings of shares/securities if held in physical form and mutual fund investments and details of companies, in which they hold substantial or controlling interest immediately but not later than 15 days of this Order;

ix. The directions stipulated in clauses (iii), (iv), (v), (vi) and (vii) shall cease to apply upon crediting of the impounding amount as per clause (i);

x. The direction stipulated in clause (ii) shall be modified upon crediting of the impounding amount as per clause (i) to the extent that Noticees shall be allowed to trade in cash segment but shall not be allowed to trade in equity derivatives segment (both options and futures) in the securities markets (In case of the Noticee No. 1, this direction applies to its proprietary trading account only).

xi. If Noticees have any open position in any exchange traded derivative contracts, as on the date of the order, they can close out/square off such open positions within 3 months from the date of order or at the expiry of such contracts, whichever is earlier. The Noticees are permitted to settle the pay-in and pay-out obligations in respect of transactions, if any, which have taken place before the close of trading hours on the date of this order. Banks are allowed to debit the accounts for the purpose of complying with this direction; and

xii. Noticees are directed to co-operate with SEBI during the examination/investigation in the instant matter."

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an *ex parte* order has been passed against him, without affording any opportunity to refute the allegations. He submits that though certain figures have been mentioned in the impugned order, the same are not borne out

from the record.

3. He submits that, similarly, the respondent department though considered the profit made by the petitioner, have failed to take note of the losses suffered, and therefore a lien of a huge amount of money has been created.

4. The learned Senior Counsel for the respondent, at the outset, submits that the petitioner has an efficacious alternate remedy in the form of an appeal before the Securities Appellate Tribunal (‘**SAT**’) under Section 15(T) of the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 (‘**SEBI Act**’).

5. The respondent, by the impugned order, has passed certain directions to protect the interest of the investors and integrity of the securities market in terms of Section 19 read with Sections 11(1), 11(4) and 11B of the SEBI Act, and issued directions of creating a lien for a sum of ₹22,06,44,706/- and ₹6,05,63,836/-.

6. The argument raised by the petitioner is that the directions contained in paragraph 221 - iii, iv, v, vi & vii, could not have been passed after the SEBI had already created a lien on the aforesaid sum. When certain directions to the bank have been passed, thereby impounding the bank account of the petitioner to the extent of the aforesaid amount, no such directions could have been passed to the banks for not allowing further debits. He submits that the lien as per SEBI could only be to the extent of the amount mentioned in the order and any other transaction of the petitioner could not have been stopped.

7. The argument at the first blush appears to be attractive, however, considering that the petitioner has an efficacious remedy in the form of an appeal, this Court is refraining from passing any order

or giving any *prima facie* finding in that regard.

8. In regard to the contention of the petitioner that the impugned order has been passed without due application of mind, I agree with the contention raised by the learned counsel for the respondent that the petitioner has an alternate remedy available in the facts of the present case and all the arguments can be taken by the petitioner before the Appellate Tribunal.

9. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of, granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate forum. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

10. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 23, 2026

"hkaur"