PANEL OF RECOVERY OFFICERS
APPOINTED UNDER SECTION 28A OF THE SEBI ACT, 1992
DISCHARGING FUNCTIONS IN TERMS OF THE ORDERS PASSED BY THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA DATED 08.08.2024 AND 19.02.2026
IN THE MATTER OF PACL LTD.

I.A. No(s).	**43457 of 2021 & 43459 of 2021**
File No.	**SEBI/PACL/OBJ/RG/00720/2026**
Name of the Objectors/Applicants	**1. Mr. Laxman Singh** **2. Mrs. Leela Pokhriyal** **3. Mr. Bijendra Singh** **4. Mr. Himmat Singh Rana** **5. Mrs. Rakhi** **6. Mr. Prem Singh** **7. Mrs. Kalpeshwari Navani**
MR No (s).	**Not provided**

Background:

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as **"SEBI"**) on August 22, 2014 had passed an order against PACL Limited, its promoters and directors, inter alia, holding the schemes run by PACL Ltd. as Collective Investment Scheme (**"CIS"**) and directing them to refund the amounts collected from the investors within three months from the date of the order. Vide the said order, it was also directed that PACL Ltd. and its promoters/ directors shall not alienate or dispose of or sell any of the assets of PACL Ltd. except for the purpose of making refunds as directed in the order.

पता (केवल पत्राचार हेतु) / Address for correspondence only:
सेबी भवन, प्लॉट सं. सी4-ए, 'जी' ब्लॉक, बांद्रा कुर्ला कॉम्प्लेक्स, बांद्रा (पूर्व), मुंबई - 400051
SEBI Bhavan, BKC, Plot No. C4-A, 'G' Block, Bandra-Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai - 400051

2. The order passed by SEBI was challenged by PACL Ltd. and four of its directors by filing appeals before the Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal (**"SAT"**). The said appeals were dismissed by the Hon'ble SAT vide its common order dated August 12, 2015, with a direction to the appellants to refund the amounts collected from the investors within three months. Aggrieved by the order dated August 12, 2015 passed by the Hon'ble SAT, PACL Ltd and its directors had filed appeals before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

3. The Hon'ble Supreme Court did not grant any stay on the aforementioned impugned order dated August 12, 2015 of the Hon'ble SAT, however, PACL Ltd. and its promoters/ directors did not refund the money to the investors. Accordingly, SEBI initiated recovery proceedings under Section 28A of the SEBI Act, 1992 against PACL Ltd. and its promoters/ directors vide recovery certificate no. 832 of 2015 drawn on December 11, 2015 and as a consequence thereof, all bank/ demat accounts and folios of mutual funds of PACL Ltd. and its promoters/ directors were attached by the Recovery Officer vide attachment order dated December 11, 2015.

4. During the hearing on the aforesaid civil appeals filed by PACL Ltd. and its directors (*Civil Appeal No. 13301 of 2015 – Subrata Bhattacharya Vs. SEBI and other connected matters*), the Hon'ble Court vide its order dated February 02, 2016 directed SEBI to constitute a committee under the Chairmanship of Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.M. Lodha, the former Chief Justice of India (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee") for disposing of the land purchased by PACL Ltd. so that the sale proceeds can be paid to the investors, who have invested their funds in PACL Ltd. for purchase of the land. In the said civil appeals, the Hon'ble Supreme Court did not grant any stay on the orders passed by SEBI and the Hon'ble SAT. Therefore, directions for refund and direction regarding restraint on the PACL Ltd. and its promoters and directors from disposing, alienating or selling the assets of PACL Ltd., as given in the order, continues till date.

5. The Committee has from time to time requested the authorities for registration and revenue of different states to take necessary steps and issue necessary directions to Land Revenue Officers and Sub-registrar offices, to not effect registration/mutation/sale/transfer, etc. of properties wherein PACL Ltd. and/ or its group or its associates have, in any manner, right or interest.

6. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated July 25, 2016 restrained PACL Ltd. and/ or its Directors/Promoters/agents/employees/Group and/or associate companies from, in any manner, selling/transferring/alienating any of the properties wherein PACL Ltd. has, in any manner, a right/interest situated either within or outside India.

7. In the recovery proceedings mentioned in para 4 above, the Recovery Officer issued an attachment order dated September 07, 2016 against 640 associate companies of PACL Ltd. In the said order, *inter alia*, the registration authorities of all States and Union Territories were requested not to act upon any documents purporting to be dealing with transfer of properties by PACL Ltd. and / or the group/ associate entities of PACL Ltd. mentioned in the Annexure to the said attachment order, if presented for registration.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide its order dated November 15, 2017, passed in Civil Appeal No. 13301/2015 and connected matters directed that all the grievances/ objections pertaining to the properties of PACL Ltd. would be taken up by Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.).

9. On April 30, 2019, in the recovery proceedings initiated against PACL Ltd. and Ors., the Recovery Officer issued a notice of attachment in respect of 25 front companies of PACL Ltd. Thereafter, on March 01, 2021, the Recovery Officer issued another notice of attachment in respect of 32 associate companies of PACL Ltd., which included 25 front companies of PACL Ltd. whose accounts were attached vide order dated April 30, 2019.

वसूली अधिकारियों का पैनल Panel of Recovery Officers पी ए सी एल लि. के मामले से संबंधित, मुंबई In the matter of Pacl Ltd. Mumbai

10. Vide order dated August 08, 2024 passed in *Civil Appeal No. 13301 of 2015 - Subrata Bhattacharya Vs. SEBI and other connected matters,* the Hon'ble Supreme Court has directed as under:

> *".....10. Since, we had directed in our order dated 25.07.2024, that no fresh applications or objections shall be filed before or entertained by Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) and that the same shall be filed before the Committee, the Committee may deal with such applications/ objections, if filed before it, and dispose them of as per the provisions contained under Section-28(A) of the SEBI Act……………"*

11. In compliance with the aforesaid order dated August 08, 2024 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, all objections with respect to properties of PACL Ltd, which were pending before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) and all new objections, are now to be dealt by the Recovery Officers attached to the Committee.

12. Subsequently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed the order dated February 19, 2026 in the matter of Subrata Bhattacharya vs. SEBI (Civil Appeal No. 13301 of 2015) directing, *inter alia*, that all interlocutory applications/Transferred Case falling under Category B, i.e. 106 sets of applications including the instant application, filed against the recommendations of Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.), be placed before the Recovery Officers appointed under Section 28A of the SEBI Act, 1992. Accordingly, all such applications, including the instant application, are now to be dealt by the Recovery Officers appointed under Section 28A of the SEBI Act, 1992 in the matter of PACL Ltd.

Present Interlocutory Application (I.A.):

13. The instant I.A. has been filed by (i) Mr. Laxman Singh s/o Mr. Madan Singh (**Applicant 1**), residing at Karligard, Sahstradhara, Dehradun, Uttarakhand (ii) Mrs. Leela Pokhriyal w/o Mr. Manoj Pokriyal d/o Mr. Budhi Ballabh Sharma (**Applicant 2**), residing at 8, Sevak Ashram Road, Dehradun, Uttarakhand (iii) Mr. Bijendra Singh s/o late Mr. Balveer Singh (**Applicant**

3), residing at Sarona, Sahstradhara, Dehradun, Uttarakhand (iv) Mr. Himmat Singh Rana s/o Mr. Kalam Singh Rana (**Applicant 4**), residing at Balawala, Tehsil & Distt. Dehradun (v) Mrs. Rakhi w/o Mr. Vijay Prakash (**Applicant 5**), residing at Budhakedar, Distt. Tehri Garhwal, Uttarakhand (vi) Mr. Prem Singh s/o Mr. Devi Singh (**Applicant 6**), residing at Sahstradhara, Dehradun, Uttarakhand and (vii) Mrs. Kalpeshwari Navani w/o Mr. L. N. Navani (**Applicant 7**), residing at Shivlok Colony Raipur, Dehradun Uttarkashi, Uttarakhand (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "**Objectors/Applicants**"), challenging the order dated September 05, 2019 passed by Shri. R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) (hereinafter referred to as the "**impugned order**") in objection petition no. 668, whereby the objection seeking issuance of No Objection Certificate ("NOC") in respect of certain land parcels was dismissed. The properties in question comprise of the following lands (hereinafter referred as the "**impugned properties**"), all situated at Mauza Amwala Tarla, Pargana Parwadun, Tehsil & District Dehradun Uttarakhand:

Applicant	**Plot description**
1. Mr. Laxman Singh	Khasra No. 351 admeasuring 89.38 sqm (0.008938 Hectares), Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 78.58 sqm (0.007858 Hectares). Total area: 167.96 sqm (0.016796 Hectares).
2. Mrs. Leela Pokhriyal	Khasra No. 351 min admeasuring 147 sqm (0.0147 Hectares).
3. Mr. Bijendra Singh 4. Mr. Himmat Singh Rana	Khasra No. 343 admeasuring 21.09 sqm (0.002109 Hectares).
5. Mrs. Rakhi w/o Mr. Vijay Prakash	Khasra No. 343 admeasuring 62.08 sqm (0.006208 Hectares).
6. Mr. Prem Singh	Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 31 sqm (0.0031 Hectares), Khasra No. 341 admeasuring 03 sqm (0.0003 Hectares), Khasra No. 342 admeasuring 128 sqm (0.0128 Hectares). Total area: 162 sqm (0.0162 Hectares).
7. Mrs. Kalpeshwari Navani	Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 219 sqm (0.0219 Hectares).

वसूली अधिकारियों का पैनल Panel of Recovery Officers
पी ए सी एल के मामले से संबंधित, मुंबई In the matter of PACL Ltd Mumbai

14. It is noted that the Applicants/Objectors had initially filed an objection dated June 06, 2019 before Shri. R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) seeking NOC in respect of the impugned properties. Shri. R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.), vide order dated September 05, 2019 in file no. 668, dismissed the Objectors' application, primarily on the grounds that the seller i.e., Mr. Gurpreet Singh s/o Mr. Nachhatar Singh *(predecessor-in-title of the Applicants)* had no independent income and bought the impugned properties using funds advanced by PACL and because PACL acquired those funds by deviously defrauding over 5.8 crore investors, the seller cannot be said to have a valid title to the impugned land. Consequently, the seller could not have passed a valid title to the Objectors/Applicants, meaning thereby that the Applicants cannot be legally considered as "*bonafide purchasers*". The relevant portion of the impugned order dated September 05, 2019 is reproduced as under:

> *"15. The learned counsel for the objectors has argued that the above referred entries dated 31/03/2007 were rectified by PACL itself on 03/12/2008 in the copy of the ledger account statedly pertaining to Gurpreet Singh above named meaning thereby that the authenticity of the entries dated 31/03/2007 stands negated but I find myself unable to accept this argument because the rectification dated 03/12/2008 shows entrustment of the amounts detailed therein by PACL Ltd to Gurpreet Singh who as mentioned above is not shown or proved to have had any independent source of income, apart as a nominee of PACL, to incur the aforesaid amount of expenses in purchase of the land in question and as a necessary consequence, he cannot be considered to have passed on valid title in favour of the objector above named by executing sale deeds in the favour as detailed in para 3 of this order above. Even the advancement of the aforesaid amounts by PACL Ltd to Gurpreet Singh above named does not vest any title to the lands in question in as much as even PACL Ltd is not shown to have had any income of its own other than that collected deviously from 5,85,40,150 number of its customers as referred to in para 11 of this order above vide relied upon the order dated 22/08/2014, passed by Shri Prashant Saran, Whole Time Member, SEBI in the matter of PACL Ltd. Resultantly, the objectors herein cannot be considered to be "bonafide purchasers" of the land in question on the basis of the said sale deeds and consequently the objection petition in hand is held to be devoid of any merit and is thus hereby dismissed."*

वसूली अधिकारियों का पैनल Panel of Recovery Officers पी ए सी एल लि के मामले से संबंधित, मुंबई In the matter of Pacl Ltd. Mumbai

15. The Applicants/Objectors, being aggrieved by the aforesaid order dated September 05, 2019 passed by Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.), have filed the present I.A No. **43459 of 2021** for stay of the auction of the impugned properties claimed by the Applicants and to set aside the Order/recommendations dated September 05, 2019 of Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) in File No. 668. Further, the Applicants have filed I.A No. **43457 of 2021** for impleadment of the Applicants as party respondents in the Civil Appeal in the matter of *Subrata Bhattacharya vs. SEBI (Supra)* pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

16. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide order dated February 19, 2026, while taking note of the segregation of the interlocutory applications (I.As) into five distinct categories i.e. Category A to E, observed that the issues arising in the identified 106 I.As (including the present I.As) require a detailed scrutiny of documentary material to determine the true nature and ownership of the properties in question and thus, directed that such matters ["Category B" applications i.e., applications challenging dismissal of objections by Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.)] be placed before Recovery Officers appointed under Section 28A of the SEBI Act, 1992, for examination. In view of the same, the instant I.As are being considered and examined by the Panel of Recovery Officers appointed under Section 28A of the SEBI Act, 192.

17. On perusal of the I.A filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is noted that the Objectors/Applicants had submitted the following:

A. <u>Applicant 1 (Mr. Laxman Singh) and Applicant 2 (Mrs. Leela Pokhriyal):</u>

17.1 It is the case of the Applicants that land parcels admeasuring a total area of 0.1540 Hectares, comprising Khasra No. 351 admeasuring 0.0800 Hectares and Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 0.0740 Hectares at Mauza Amwala Tarla, Pargana Parwadun, Tehsil & District Dehradun Uttarakhand, were originally owned and possessed by (i) Mr. Radheshyam, (ii) Mr. Rajpal, (iii) Mr. Fate Singh, (iv) Mr. Deepak, (v) Mr. Pradeep and (vi) Mrs. Hemlata, who had transferred these land parcels to one Mr. Gurpreet Singh s/o

Mr. Nachhatar Singh vide a registered Sale Deed dated August 29, 2005 bearing document no. 6221, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 3,24,000/-, paid via DD no. 003144 dated August 25, 2005. This transfer was mutated in the revenue records via order 2202 on July 04, 2006. Subsequently, Mr. Gurpreet Singh conveyed the entire aforesaid land parcels to Applicant 1 vide Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1476 for total sale consideration of Rs. 36,96,000/-, out of which Rs. 24,50,000/- was paid via cheques (Rs. 5,00,000/- via cheque no. 466830, Rs. 9,50,000/- via cheque no. 466833 and Rs. 10,00,000/- via cheque no. 462091) and the balance amount of Rs. 12,46,000/- in cash. This transaction was mutation in the revenue records via mutation order no. 6626 on May 04, 2013.

17.2 It is further submitted that Applicant 1 thereafter subdivided and sold most of the aforesaid land parcels through various Sale Deeds to different individuals (06 in total) including Mr. Manish Chhetri and Mrs. Shivani Chhetri to whom total land area to the extent of 292.66 sqm (0.029266 Hectares) comprised in Khasra No. 351 admeasuring 167.25 sqm (0.016725 Hectares) and Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 125.41 sqm (0.012541 Hectares) were conveyed vide Sale Deed dated October 24, 2013 bearing document no. 5014, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 10,50,000/-. This transfer was mutated in revenue records via mutation order no. 915 on January 30, 2014.

17.3 Out of the aforesaid land admeasuring 292.66 sqm (0.029266 Hectares), Mr. Manish Chhetri and Mrs. Shivani Chhetri subsequently sold land parcels admeasuring 167.25 sqm (0.016725 Hectares) in Khasra No. 351 to Applicant 2 vide Sale Deed dated February 25, 2015 bearing document no. 4775, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 11,55,000/-, paid entirely in cash. This transfer was mutated in revenue records via mutation order no. 5073 on July 04, 2015. Considering that out of all the subsequent buyers who purchased the lands from Applicant 1, only Applicant 2 received attachment notice, the said Applicant had also filed an objection before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.).

17.4 Consequent to successive transfers, it is submitted that Applicant 1 currently retain only a residual area in the impugned properties, i.e., land admeasuring a total area of 167.96

sqm (0.016796 Hectares) comprising of Khasra No. 351 admeasuring 89.38 sqm (0.008938 Hectares) and Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 78.58 sqm (0.007858 Hectares). Furthermore, Applicant 2 retains an area admeasuring 147 sqm (0.0147 Hectares) in Khasra No. 351 min.

B. Applicant 3 (Mr. Bijendra Singh), Applicant 4 (Mr. Himmat Singh Rana) and Applicant 5 (Mrs. Rakhi):

17.5 It is the case of the Applicants that land parcel admeasuring 0.1980 Hectares at Khasra No. 343 at Mauza Amwala Tarla, Pargana Parwadun, Tehsil & District Dehradun Uttarakhand, was originally owned and possessed by Mr. Ramesh Chand Pant, who transferred it to one Mr. Gurpreet Singh s/o Mr. Nachhatar Singh vide a registered Sale Deed dated August 29, 2005 bearing document no. 6186, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 4,16,000/-, paid via DD no. 003145 dated August 25, 2005. This transfer was mutated in the revenue records via order 2206 on March 18, 2006. Subsequently, Mr. Gurpreet Singh conveyed the entire aforesaid land parcel to Applicants 3 and 4 vide Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1477 for total sale consideration of Rs. 47,52,000/-, paid entirely in cash. This transfer was mutated in revenue records via mutation order no. 6627 on May 03, 2013.

17.6 It is further submitted that Applicants 3 and 4 later sold most of the aforesaid land parcels to different individuals (12 in total) including to Applicant 5 to whom land parcel to the extent of 62.08 sqm (0.006208 Hectares) in Khasra Nos. 343 was sold vide Sale Deed dated December 13, 2013 bearing document no. 5857, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 2,24,000/-, paid entirely in cash. This transfer was mutated in revenue records via mutation order no. 2232 on February 20, 2014. Considering that out of all the subsequent buyers who purchased the lands from Applicants 3and 4, only Applicant 5 got knowledge of auction of her land, the said Applicant had also filed an objection before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.).

17.7 Consequent to successive transfers, it is submitted that Applicants 3 and 4 currently retain only a residual area in the impugned properties, i.e., land admeasuring 21.09 sqm (0.002109 Hectares) in Khasra No. 343. Furthermore, Applicant 5 retains an area admeasuring 62.08 sqm (0.006208 Hectares) in the same Khasra No. 343.

C. <u>Applicant 6 (Mr. Prem Singh) and Applicant 7 (Mrs. Kalpeshwari Navani):</u>

17.8 It is the case of the Applicants that land parcel admeasuring a total area of 0.1805 Hectares, comprising Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 0.1090 Hectares, Khasra No. 341 admeasuring 0.0185 Hectares and Khasra No. 342 admeasuring 0.0530 hectares situated at Mauza Amwala Tarla, Pargana Parwadun, Tehsil & District Dehradun Uttarakhand, were originally owned and possessed by (i) Mr. Devgiri, (ii) Mr. Rajender Giri, (iii) Mr. Satish Giri, and (iv) Mr. Ratan Giri, who had transferred these land parcels to one Mr. Gurpreet Singh s/o Mr. Nachhatar Singh vide a registered Sale Deed dated August 29, 2005 bearing document no. 6231, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 3,80,000/-, paid via DD nos. 003142, 003146 and 003148 (*not dated*). This transfer was mutated in the revenue records via order 2201 on March 18, 2006. Subsequently, Mr. Gurpreet Singh conveyed the entire aforesaid land parcels to Applicant 6 vide Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1478 for total sale consideration of Rs. 43,32,000/-, paid via cheques (Rs. 5,00,000/- via cheque no. 013465 and Rs. 38,32,000/- via cheque no. 013470). This transaction was mutation in the revenue records via mutation order no. 6628 on May 04, 2013.

17.9 It is further submitted that Applicant 6 later subdivided and sold most of the aforesaid land parcels to different individuals (10 in total) including to Applicant 7 to whom land parcel to the extent of 391.65 sqm (0.039165 Hectares) in Khasra Nos. 353 was conveyed vide Sale Deed dated September 16, 2013 bearing document no. 4399, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 15,51,000/-, paid via cheque no. 230988. This transfer was mutated in revenue records via mutation order no. 6800 on June 17, 2013. Considering that out of all the subsequent buyers who purchased the lands from Applicant 6, only Applicant 7 got knowledge of auction of her land, the said Applicant had also filed an objection before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.).

17.10 Consequent to successive transfers, it is submitted that Applicant 6 currently retain only a residual area in the impugned properties, i.e., admeasuring a total area of 162 sqm (0.0162 Hectares) comprising of Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 31 sqm (0.0031 Hectares), Khasra No. 341 admeasuring 03 sqm (0.0003 Hectares) and Khasra No. 342 admeasuring 128 sqm (0.0128 Hectares). Furthermore, Applicant 7 retains an area admeasuring 219 sqm (0.0219 Hectares) in Khasra No. 353.

18. It is submitted that all the Sale Deeds vide which the Applicants came in ownership of their respective portions of the impugned properties, were *bonafide* transactions executed well prior to the order dated February 02, 2016 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Consequently, it is contended by the Applicants that the attachment of these properties is erroneous and perverse. This wrongful inclusion is further supported by subsequent order dated August 04, 2017 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which directed PACL to furnish details of properties it still owned as of that date. The Applicants therefore submit that as the impugned properties were sold in favor of the Applicants much prior to the year 2017 through valid Sale Deeds, their inclusion in the PACL's property list is erroneous and are thus, liable to be released in favor of the Applicants. The Applicants only became aware of the impending auction of the impugned properties when the prospective bidders began frequently visiting the sites to inspect the impugned properties and make inquiries.

19. Further, the Applicants/Objectors has, *inter alia*, objected to the aforesaid order dated September 05, 2019 passed by Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) in File No. 668, submitting that the impugned properties cannot be put up for auction on the following grounds:

a) The Applicants are *bona fide* purchasers who exercised all reasonable care to verify the transferor's legal authority to transfer the title and acquired absolute ownership and physical possession of their respective properties through registered sale deeds by paying full sale consideration through cheques, and their names duly mutated in the revenue records and has thus acted in good faith. Thus, such possession is protected under Section 53A of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882 (TPA).

b) The properties were purchased from an individual viz. Mr. Gurpreet Singh and not PACL. Thus, the buyer had no reasonable means of discovering the seller to be a person having nexus with the company. Furthermore, the transactions were finalized well before the Hon'ble Supreme Court's restrictive order dated February 2, 2016.

c) No public notice/notification regarding restriction/stay order by SEBI were displayed on the land or at local regulatory offices at the time of purchase by the Applicants. Further, the revenue and registration authorities validated the transactions in toto by accepting fees and mutating the titles without any objection.

d) The Sale Deeds were legally executed, duly registered on payment of proper stamp duty and registration fee, complete sale consideration paid to the seller, mutation and possession duly recorded in the name of the Applicants in revenue records, hence any action against land in question will raise other legal impediments and legal problems and complicate the matter in the present case.

e) The Hon'ble Supreme court by its order dated August 04, 2017 had directed PACL to furnish details of properties that were still owned by PACL as on that date. In other words, the order affected only those properties which were already available and owned by the company as on August 04, 2017. As the properties were sold in favor of the Applicants/Objectors much prior to February 2017, the impugned properties are entitled to be released in favor of the Applicants/Objectors.

The Objectors/Applicants have, thus, prayed for:

(i) allowing the present application and staying the auction of the alleged impugned properties of the Applicants.

(ii) setting aside the order/recommendation dated September 05, 2019 passed by Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.), in the matter of PACL Ltd in File No. 668 and also the attachment order(s) pertaining to the properties belonging to the

Applicants/Objectors and release them along with construction thereon, if any, to them.

20. In compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Applicants were granted opportunities of hearings on April 09, 2026 and April 23, 2026. During the hearings, the Applicants were represented by an Authorized Representative (**'AR'**), who, while reiterating the averments made in the I.A and the objection filed before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.), submitted as under:

a) The impugned properties were purchased by Mr. Gurpreet Singh in his individual capacity, and there was no revenue record on file showing or reflecting PACL's name in relation to these properties. Consequently, the Objectors/Applicants could not have ascertained any alleged connection to PACL during their due diligence prior to purchasing the impugned properties.

b) PACL's claim of having provided funds to its associate i.e., Mr. Mr. Gurpreet Singh *(predecessor-in-title of the Objectors/Applicants),* for the procurement of the impugned properties is doubtful, given that the ledger extracts filed in support of the claim show transactions pertaining to the year 2008, whereas the purported agent/associate had already purchased the impugned properties in the year 2005.

c) PACL's previous complaints regarding the illegal sales of its properties is irrelevant to the present matters as the copy of complaint filed before the Dehradun authorities submitted by PACL in the proceedings before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) in support of its claim neither has any mention of the impugned properties nor has any mention of the Objectors/Applicants.

21. Based on the submissions made and discussions held during the hearing, the AR for the Objectors/Applicants was advised to furnish translated copies of the annexures filed with the I.A, Encumbrance Certificate / Revenue records and Land Tax payment receipts pertaining to the impugned properties, details and proof of payment of sale consideration paid by each of

पता (केवल पत्राचार हेतु) / Address for correspondence only:
सेबी भवन, प्लॉट सं. सी4-ए, 'जी' ब्लॉक, बांद्रा कुर्ला कॉम्प्लेक्स, बांद्रा (पूर्व), मुंबई - 400051
SEBI Bhavan, BKC, Plot No. C4-A, 'G' Block, Bandra-Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai - 400051

the Objectors/Applicants for purchase of the impugned properties and exact extent of land being claimed by each Objectors/Applicants within a period of one week from the date of hearing, i.e., on or before April 30, 2026. Subsequently, vide emails dated May 04, 2026, June 02, 2026, June 18, 2026, July 09, 2026, July 21, 2026 and July 25, 2026, the Applicants submitted additional submissions along with the translated Sale Deeds, revenue records and bank statements (*of Applicant 6 and 7 only*) which have been taken on record. In addition, vide email dated June 11, 2026, the AR submitted that the impugned properties were Bhumidhari Lands under the Uttar Pradesh Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act, 1950 (*as applicable in Uttarakhand*) on which the tax was exempted. Later, vide Notification dated April 05, 2018, the said properties were transferred to municipal area and are presently subject to a 10 years cooling off period for the payment of tax. Consequently, it is submitted that no land tax payment receipts are available.

22. Upon perusal of the I.A and the objection along with its annexures filed before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) and the documents produced before the Panel of Recovery Officers, the following is observed by the Panel:

a) Vide a registered Sale Deed dated August 29, 2005 bearing document no. 6221, Mr. Gurpreet Singh s/o Mr. Nachhattar Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)* acquired land parcels admeasuring a total area of 0.1540 Hectares, comprising Khasra No. 351 admeasuring 0.0800 Hectares and Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 0.0740 Hectares at Mauza Amwala Tarla, Pargana Parwadun, Tehsil & District Dehradun Uttarakhand, from one Mr. Radheshyam & 05 others. This transfer was mutated in the Land Revenue Records i.e., Khatauni, via mutation order in case no. 2202 dated July 04, 2006 at Khata no. 00627. Subsequently, vide Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1476, Mr. Gurpreet Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)*, conveyed the entire aforesaid land parcel admeasuring 0.1540 Hectares to Applicant 1, which was mutated in the Khatauni for Fasli Year 1416-1421 via mutation order in case no. 6626 dated May 04, 2013 at Khata no. 00312. Applicant 1 thereafter sold most of the aforesaid land parcels through various Sale Deeds to different individuals, including a portion of total area 292.66 sqm (0.029266 Hectares) comprising of 167.25 sqm (0.016725 Hectares) in Khasra No. 351 and 125.41 sqm (0.012541 Hectares) in Khasra No. 352 to one Mr. Maneesh Chhetri and Mrs. Shivani Chhetri vide Sale Deed dated October 24, 2013 bearing document no. 5014. In the Khatauni for Fasli Year 1422-1427 Khata no. 01013, Mr. Maneesh Chhetri and Mrs. Shivani Chhetri are duly recorded as khatedar for said land parcels via mutation order in case no. 5072 dated July 09, 2015 at Khata no. 00627. Out of these land parcels, Mr. Maneesh Chhetri and Mrs. Shivani Chhetri conveyed a portion admeasuring 167.25 sqm (0.016725 Hectares) in Khasra No. 351 to Applicant 2 vide Sale Deed dated May 23, 2015 bearing document no. 4775, which was mutated in the Khatauni for Fasli Year 1422-1427, via mutation order in case no. 5073 dated July 04, 2015 at khata no. 01013.

b) Vide a registered Sale Deed dated August 29, 2005 bearing document no. 6186, Mr. Gurpreet Singh s/o Mr. Nachhattar Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)* acquired a land parcel bearing Khasra No. 343 admeasuring 0.1980 Hectares at Mauza Amwala Tarla, Pargana Parwadun, Tehsil & District Dehradun Uttarakhand from one Mr. Ramesh Chand Pant. This transfer was mutated in the Khatauni for Fasli Year 1410-1415, via mutation order in case no. 2206 dated March 18, 2006 at khata no. 00530. Subsequently, vide Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1477, Mr. Gurpreet Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)*, conveyed the entire aforesaid land parcel admeasuring 0.1980 Hectares to Applicants 3 and 4, which was mutated in the Khatauni for Fasli Year 1416-1421 via mutation order in case no. 6627 dated May 03, 2013 at khata no. 00314. Applicants 3 and 4 thereafter sold most of the aforesaid land parcels to different individuals, including a portion of land parcel admeasuring 62.08 sqm (0.0062 sqm Hectares) in Khasra No. 343 to Applicant 5 vide Sale Deed dated December 13, 2013 bearing document no. 5857, which was mutated in the Khatauni for Fasli Year 1416-1421, via mutation order in case no. 2232 dated February 20, 2014 at khata no. 00314.

c) Vide a registered Sale Deed dated August 29, 2005 bearing document no. 6231, Mr. Gurpreet Singh s/o Mr. Nachhattar Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)* acquired land parcels admeasuring a total area of 0.1805 Hectares, comprising Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 0.1090 Hectares, Khasra No. 341 admeasuring 0.0185 Hectares and Khasra No. 342 kha admeasuring 0.0530 Hectares at Mauza Amwala Tarla, Pargana Parwadun, Tehsil & District Dehradun Uttarakhand, from one Mr. Devgiri & 03 others. This transfer was mutated in the Khatauni for Fasli Year 1410-1415, via mutation order in case no. 2201 dated March 18, 2006 at khata no. 00294. Subsequently, vide Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1478, Mr. Gurpreet Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)*, conveyed the entire aforesaid land parcel admeasuring 0.1805 Hectares to Applicant 6, which was mutated in the Khatauni for Fasli Year 1416-1421, via mutation order in case no. 6628 dated May 04, 2013 at khata no. 00316. Applicant 6 thereafter sold most of the aforesaid land parcels to different individuals, including portion of land parcel admeasuring 391.65 sqm (0.0039165 Hectares) in Khasra No. 353 to Applicant 7 vide Sale Deed dated September 16, 2013 bearing document no. 4399. In the Khatauni for Fasli Year 1422-1427 khata no. 00306, Applicant 7's name is duly recorded for said land admeasuring 0.00392 Hectares, alongside an entry showing a further conveyance of 0.0173 Hectares. Consequently, Applicant 7 retains a residual balance of 0.0219 Hectares in Khasra No. 353, which corresponds with the impugned property currently being claimed.

d) With respect to the details and proof of payment of the sale consideration paid by each Objector/Applicant for the purchase of the impugned properties, following was observed:

Applicant	Sale Consideration payment details	Observations/Remarks
Applicant 1 Mr. Laxman Singh	Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1476 for total sale consideration of Rs. 36,96,000/-: ➢ Rs. 12,46,000 paid in cash, ➢ Rs. 10,00,000/- via cheque no. 462091, Syndicate bank.	The AR vide email dated July 25, 2026, submitted Canara Bank statement for the period April 30, 2013 to April 30, 2013 (as Syndicate Bank has since merged with Canara Bank) of Applicant 1. On perusal of the said bank statement, a transaction dated April 30, 2013 of Rs. 10,00,000/- with Ref/Chq. No 610001462091 in favour of Mr. Gurpreet Singh was observed which matches with the payment details as mentioned in the respective Sale Deed.

पता (केवल पत्राचार हेतु) / Address for correspondence only:
सेबी भवन, प्लॉट सं. सी4-ए, 'जी' ब्लॉक, बांद्रा कुर्ला कॉम्प्लेक्स, बांद्रा (पूर्व), मुंबई - 400051
SEBI Bhavan, BKC, Plot No. C4-A, 'G' Block, Bandra-Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai - 400051

वसूली अधिकारियों का पैनल Panel of Recovery Officers, पी ए सी एल के मामले में संबंधित, मुंबई In the matter of PACL Ltd. Mumbai

	➢ Rs. 5,00,000/- via cheque no. 466830, PNB bank and ➢ Rs. 9,50,000/- via cheque no. 466833, PNB bank.	As regard to the remaining payment of Rs. 14,50,000 (Rs. 5,00,000 + Rs. 9,50,000) by Applicant 1 Mr. Laxman Singh through his PNB bank account, no documentary evidence has been provided.
Applicant 2 Mrs. Leela Pokhriyal	Sale Deed dated February 25, 2015 bearing document no. 4775, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 11,55,000/-, paid entirely in cash	The AR submits that the sale consideration has been paid in cash as mentioned in the respective Sale Deed. No documentary evidence has been provided for any of the cash payments.
Applicant 3 Mr. Bijender and **Applicant 4** Mr. Himmat Singh (purchased jointly)	Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1477 for total sale consideration of Rs. 47,52,000/-, paid entirely in cash.	
Applicant 5 Mrs. Rakhi	Sale Deed dated December 13, 2013 bearing document no. 5857, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 2,24,000/-, paid entirely in cash.	
Applicant 6 Mr. Prem Singh	Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1478 for total sale consideration of Rs. 43,32,000/-: ➢ Rs. 5,00,000/- via cheque no. 013465, Central bank of India and ➢ Rs. 38,32,000/- via cheque no. 013470 Central bank of India.	The AR vide email dated July 09, 2026, submitted Central bank of India bank statement for the period March 01, 2013 to December 01, 2013. Upon perusal of the said bank statement, it was observed that the transactions highlighted do not match the cheques mentioned in the respective Sale Deed. Upon seeking clarification for such discrepancy, the AR vide email dated July 25, 2026 submitted a Rectification Deed *(rectification to the earlier Deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1478)* dated October 21, 2013 bearing no. 4939, which while dealing with the same land extents as in the earlier deed, rectified the payments of Rs. 38,32,000/- *(via cheque no. 013470 in the earlier deed)* to 08 separate cheque bearing nos. 018381, 018382, 018383, 018384, 018385, 018386, 018387 and 018388 of Rs. 4,79,000 each. totalling to Rs. 38,32,000/-. On perusal of the said bank statement provided, the said 08 cheques were observed to reflected in the said bank statement totalling to Rs. 38,32,000/- in favour of Mr. Gurpreet Singh, which matches with the payment details as mentioned in the said Rectification Deed. As regard to the remaining payment of Rs. 5,00,000/- by Applicant 6 Mr. Prem Singh through his Central bank of India bank account, no documentary evidence has been provided. It is pertinent to note there that there was no mention of the abovesaid Rectification Deed in the I.A filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. However, upon perusal of the objection filed before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) and order passed by him, the said Rectification Deed finds mention. Relevant portion of the said Rectification Deed wherein details of the rectified payments are mentioned is as follows:

		3 यह कि उक्त विक्रय पत्र में भूमि विक्रय मूल्य का एक चैक सं0 013470, मु0 38,32,000/– सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, सहस्त्रधारा रोड, देहरादून द्वारा अदा किया गया। प्रथमपपक्ष/विक्रेता उक्त चैक को समयान्तर्गत बैंक में न प्रस्तुत कर पाने के कारण उसका भुगतान न प्राप्त कर सका तथा प्रथमपक्ष/विक्रेता के अनुरोध पर द्वितीयपक्ष/क्रेता द्वारा उक्त चैक की धनराशि के स्थान पर निम्नानुसार चैक द्वारा भुगतान किया जा रहा है :– 1. "रू0 4,79,000/– चैक सं0 018381, दि0 21/10/13, सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, सहस्त्रधारा रोड, देहरादून। 2. रू0 4,79,000/– चैक सं0 018382, दि0 21/10/13, सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, सहस्त्रधारा रोड, देहरादून। 3. रू0 4,79,000/– चैक सं0 018383, दि0 21/10/13, सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, सहस्त्रधारा रोड, देहरादून। 4. रू0 4,79,000/– चैक सं0 018384, दि0 21/10/13, सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, सहस्त्रधारा रोड, देहरादून। 5. रू0 4,79,000/– चैक सं0 018385, दि0 21/10/13, सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, सहस्त्रधारा रोड, देहरादून। 6. रू0 4,79,000/– चैक सं0 018386, दि0 21/10/13, सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, सहस्त्रधारा रोड, देहरादून। 7. रू0 4,79,000/– चैक सं0 018387, दि0 21/10/13, सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, सहस्त्रधारा रोड, देहरादून। 8. रू0 4,79,000/– चैक सं0 018388, दि0 21/10/13, सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया, सहस्त्रधारा रोड, देहरादून।"
Applicant 7 Mrs. Kalpeshwari Navani	Sale Deed dated September 16, 2013 bearing document no. 4399, for a total sale consideration of Rs. 15,51,000/-, paid via cheque no. 230988	The AR vide email dated June 18, 2026, submitted SBI bank statement for the period January 01, 2013 to March 31, 2014 of Applicant 7. On perusal of the said bank statement, a transaction dated October 03, 2013 of Rs. 15,51,000/- with Ref/Chq. No 230988 in favour of Mr. Prem Singh (Applicant 6) was observed which matches with the payment details as mentioned in the respective Sale Deed.

23. With respect to the submission made by the AR regarding the land tax being exempt for the impugned properties *(as mentioned in para 21 above)*, the relevant statutory provisions of the Uttar Pradesh Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act, 1950 (as applicable in Uttarakhand) (hereinafter referred as "**the Act**") were examined and the following is noted:

23.1 It is noted that Chapter X of the said Act specifies the provisions with respect to Land Revenue. Section 242(1) of the Act which states payment of land revenue in case of lands held by Bhumidars specifies the general liability of payment of tax declaring that all land held or deemed to be held by a Bhumidhar, wherever situated, is liable for the payment of land revenue to the State Government except such land as may be exempted, either wholly or partially, from such liability explicitly granted by or contracted with the State Government.

23.2 Further, Section 247A of the Act states on *'Exemption of land revenue in certain cases'* and provides exemption from the liability to pay land revenue to the State Government to every member of a family, identified as Bhumidars, whose total landholding does not exceed 1.26 hectares (3.125 acres). Section 247A reads as under:

*"**247A. Exemption of land revenue in certain cases.***

***(1)** Notwithstanding anything contained in Sections 245, 246 and 247, every member of a family, the total area of land held by whose members as Bhumidhars on or after the date of commencement of the agricultural year beginning on July 1, 1977 does not exceed 1.26 hectares (3.125 acres), shall be exempted from the liability to pay land revenue to the State Government.*

***(2)** The share of an individual or any member of his family in a holding shall, for the purposes of determining exemption under this section be decided in such manner and by such authority as may be prescribed, but no such determination shall be binding on any Court or tribunal in any suit or other proceedings relating to the title to such holding.*

***(3)** The Prescribed Authority shall prepare and publish a list, in respect of each circle, of persons entitled to the exemption mentioned in sub-section (1) containing such particulars, in such form and manner and before such dates as may be prescribed and shall cause relevant extracts from the list to be delivered to the persons concerned.*

***(4)** Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the land revenue assessed under Sections 245, 246 and 247 for a holding shall be recorded in full in the record of rights, and shall, for all other purposes, be deemed to be the land revenue payable by him.*

Explanation. - For the purpose of this section, 'Family' consists of an individual, his or her spouse and minor children, whether they are joint or not with the individual."

23.3 The said Act was amended vide Uttarakhand Act No. 14 of 2011 effective from April 29, 2011 and the said Act, as per the amendment, extends to the whole State of Uttarakhand except the areas included and may be included from time to time in any Municipal Corporation, Nagar Panchayat, Nagar Parishad and Cantonment Board limits. Further, the abovementioned sub-section (1) of Section 247A was substituted and after amendment reads as under:

"247A (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in Sections 245, 246 and 247, every member of a family, the total Area of land held by whose members as Bhumidhars on or after the date of commencement of the agricultural year beginning on July 1, 1977 docs not exceed 1.26 hectares (3.125 acres), shall be exempted from the liability to pay land revenue to the State Government:
Provided that such Bhumidhar, who holds the area of land more than 3.125 acre but less than 12.5 acre, the rate of laud revenue shall be One Rupee per annum.".

23.4 On perusal of the aforementioned provision, it is noted that the relief from payment of land revenue extends to families whose total landholding does not exceed 1.26 hectares (3.125 acres), which is applicable to the present case, as the transaction by Mr. Gurpreet Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)* to Applicant 1 by way of executing the sale deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1476 conveyed a total area of 0.1540 Hectares only, to Applicants 3 and 4 by way of executing the sale deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1477 conveyed a total area of 0.1980 Hectares only and to Applicant 6 by way of executing the sale deed dated March 25, 2013 bearing document no. 1478 conveyed a total area of 0.1805 Hectares only, which falls well within the prescribed limit of 1.26 hectares. However, this provision must be read in conjunction with the Uttarakhand Amendment (Uttarakhand Act No. 14 of 2011), which came into effect on April 29, 2011. The said amendment explicitly restricts the scope of

Section 247A stipulating that the exemption extends to the whole State of Uttarakhand except the areas included and may be included from time to time in any Municipal Corporation, Nagar Panchayat, Nagar Parishad and Cantonment Board limits. As can be seen from the submissions made by the AR on behalf of the Applicants/Objectors, the AR has admitted that the impugned properties were transferred into a municipal area via Notification dated April 05, 2018. Consequently, by operation of the statutory amendment enacted by the State of Uttarakhand, any exemption from payment of land revenue under Section 247A stands excluded once the land is included within municipal limits by any Municipal Corporation, Nagar Panchayat and/or Nagar Parishad. In other words, it can be said that the impugned properties acquired by Applicants 1, 3, 4 and 6 in year 2013 would fall under the said provision exempting the Applicants from payment of land revenue till the Notification dated April 05, 2018.

24. However, sub-section (3) of Section 247A of the Act clearly states that in order to be entitled for the exemption, the Prescribed Authority shall prepare, publish, and distribute official lists of persons entitled to such exemption. It is noted that the AR has not placed on record any such official list, exemption certificate, or statutory notification issued by the prescribed authority to substantiate that the impugned properties are exempted from payment of land revenue during the relevant period under Section 242 read with Section 247A of the Act. In addition, it is also noted that with respect to the submission regarding the impugned properties falling under a 10-year "cooling-off period" for tax payments, the AR has not produced any documentary evidence to substantiate the same. In view of the same, the said submissions made by the AR cannot be considered.

25. In order to further examine the present application, the Official RTI Response Letter regarding PACL – restricted Khasra numbers in Amwala Tarla, District Dehradun, Pargana Parwadoon, as furnished by the Applicants was examined. Independent verification was also conducted on the concerned official department's website eregistrationukgov.in. The website records revealed the following restriction details:

District	SRO	Village/ Location	Banned By	Other Description	Banned For Whom
DEHR ADUN	DEHRADUN-I	आमवाला तरला (श्रेणी-A)	जस्टिस आर एम लोढ़ा कमेटी माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय	03 मिन, 465ग, 48 ख, 65 ट, 65 झ, 65 मिन, 90 ख, 92 क, 93 ख, 94 च, 94 व, 94 घ, 95, 96 मिन, 99 मिन, 127,134, 135, 136, 137क,137 ख,, 138,139,140,140क, 140ग, 141 ख, 141 क, 142 मिन, 142 ग, 154 घ, 161 ख, 161 क, 164,165, 166,167, 168ख, 169 क, 169 ख, 170,175, 181, 182, 190, 195, 196, 197,198,199, 200, 201,202,203,204 क, 204 ख, 205 ख 206, 207, 208, 209क, 209 ख, 205 क, 205ख, 206,207, 208, 209क, 209ख, 210, 211क, 211 ख, 212,213,214, 215, 216, 217, 220क, 220घ, 220 ट, 220ण, 220न, 341, 342 ख, 343, 348 ख, 350क, 351, 353, 354क, 358क, 360 ग, 360 क, 360ख, 360 घ, 364, 367क, 367ख, 369 मिन, 401 ग,	Prohibited For Sub-R

26. Based on this official list from the Stamp and Registration Department, Government of Uttarakhand, the impugned properties under Khasra Nos. 341, 342 ख, 343, 351, and 353 are explicitly listed as prohibited and banned by the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee (Hon'ble Supreme Court). However, the specific land measurements under each of the said restricted Khasra Nos. have not been explicitly mentioned in the said list. Further, it is noted that Khasra No. 352 as claimed by the Applicants does not find any mention in the list of restricted Khasra Nos. Thus, even though there are no MR documents available on record, it is established from the official list of prohibited lands disseminated by the Stamp and Registration Department, Government of Uttarakhand that the impugned properties under Khasra Nos. 341, 342 ख, 343, 351, and 353 are attached as the same have been prima facie found to be PACL properties by the Sub-Registrar, Dehradun, Uttarakhand.

27. It is pertinent to note that in its reply dated July 30, 2019 file before Mr. R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.), PACL has submitted that it had procured alleged lands at Amwala Tarla in Dehradun, in the name of one of its associate Mr. Gurpreet Singh s/o Mr. Nachhattar Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)*. To substantiate its claim, PACL has also produced extracts of ledger of Mr. Gurpreet Singh from its books. As mentioned in the

पी एस एल के मामले से संबंधित, मुंबई/In the matter of Pacl Ltd. Mumbai
वसूली अधिकारियों का पैनल Panel of Recovery Officers

preceding paragraphs, it is pertinent to note that Mr. Gurpreet Singh is the same individual from whom the Objectors/Applicants claim to have acquired the impugned properties. Here, reference is made to the SEBI order dated August 22, 2014, wherein the *modus operandi* adopted by PACL Ltd. has been explained and the relevant portion of the said order explaining the same is reproduced as under:

"…………At this stage, I note from the details submitted during the course of investigation that PACL had mobilized funds from its customers to the tune of ₹ 44,736 crores till March 31, 2012. Further by its own admission, it has collected ₹ 4364,78,08,345 from 39,97,357 customers during the period of February 26, 2013 to June 15, 2014. The total amount mobilized comes to a whooping 49,100 crore. This figure could have been even more if PACL would have provided the details of the funds mobilized during the period of April 01, 2012 to February 25, 2013. The collection of such huge funds suggests that PACL has many more customers than the stated 1.22 crore. In this regard, I also refer to the proposal of PACL and its directors as forwarded to SEBI through their advocates and note that it has 4,63,13,342 customers to whom the land has not yet been allotted. Thus, a quick calculation of the total number of the customer of PACL comes to around 5.85 crore which includes the customers who said to have been allotted land and who are yet to be allotted the land……." (at pp. 71-72)

"……From the above, it is noted that PACL has very limited stock of lands in its name and that most of the lands are held through General Power of Attorney/through Agreement to Sale/through associate companies. PACL in its reply has informed that the said associate companies are controlled by its friends and nears and dears of the management of PACL. I observe that PACL enters into an MoU with the associate companies for the purchase of land. The MoU inter-alia, states that as PACL is unable to purchase the land in its own name beyond certain limits due to the land laws and other applicable laws of the land in different States of the country, PACL has nominated the associate company to purchase the land for PACL and get the sale deed executed in the name of associate company………" (at p. 80)

28. Further, reference can also be made to the aforementioned SEBI order dated August 22, 2014 wherein PACL Ltd. itself, during the proceeding before the Whole Time Member, SEBI, had admitted that for the purpose of its business, it was buying lands through its agents. The same is reproduced as under:

"………PACL uses agents to carry out its business. Depending on the years of experience, the agents are entitled to various designations. The agent in turn engages field associates who interact with the potential customers and explain the plans for purchase of land. As the business of PACL is propelled through word-of-mouth, it is important to incentivize the agents and field associates appropriately by way of commission. In the process, PACL often makes payment to the field associates directly as per the understanding with the agent in order to ensure that the field associates are not deprived of their commission, after deducting the requisite amount from the commission paid to the relevant agents. The large amount of commission, reflected in the balance sheet not only constitutes the commissions paid to the agents/ field associates, but also other commissions paid in relation to the procurement of the land by PACL and sale of spaces in residential and commercial projects developed by PACL in the ordinary course of business" (at p. 26-27)

29. Considering that the State has included the impugned properties in the list of properties prohibited to make any transfers/alienation as the said properties prima facie were that of PACL's, it can be inferred that Mr. Gurpreet Singh was acting as an agent/employee/associate of PACL Ltd. while purchasing the impugned properties, as PACL Ltd. was unable to own lands in its own name beyond certain limits due to the land laws of the country. Hence, the actual beneficial owner of the said impugned properties was no other than PACL Ltd.

30. Having said that, upon perusal of the Sale Deeds produced in support of the claim made by the Objectors/ Applicants, it is observed that vide separate Sale Deeds dated August 29, 2005 bearing document nos. 6221, 6186 and 6231, Mr. Gurpreet Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)* had acquired the impugned properties from separate individuals in his individual name. The corresponding land revenue records also reflect the said properties in his individual name viz. Mr. Gurpreet Singh *(predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)* with no mention of PACL Ltd.

31. Having regard to the above observation, it is pertinent to refer to the provision contained in Section 41 of TPA which reads as under:

41. Transfer by ostensible owner. -

Where, with the consent, express or implied, of the persons interested in immoveable property, a person is the ostensible owner of such property and transfers the same for consideration, the transfer shall not be voidable on the ground that the transferor was not authorised to make it:

Provided that the transferee, after taking reasonable care to ascertain that the transferor had power to make the transfer, has acted in good faith.

32. It can be argued that by virtue of the aforesaid provision, PACL Ltd. as well as the Committee cannot question the transfer made in favor of the Objectors/Applicants. In terms of the order dated February 02, 2016 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Committee has been authorized for selling the properties of PACL Ltd. and for making refund to its investors. Thus, the prohibition created by Section 41 of the TPA on questioning the authority of ostensible owner by the real owner, would not restrict the Committee in discharge of its mandate given to it by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and can always question the authority of the ostensible owner in making the transfer and *bonafides* of the transferee, without being bound by or without any reference to Section 41 of TPA.

33. Assuming without admitting that the transfer made by the vendor/transferor viz. Mr. Gurpreet Singh in favor of Applicants 1, 3, 4 and 6 attracts Section 41 of the TPA and thus, prohibits even the Committee, even then, under the said provision itself a transfer made by an ostensible owner, in order to attract Section 41 of the TPA, has to satisfy the test of "*reasonable care*" and "*good faith*" of the transferee as stated in the proviso to Section 41. In terms of the proviso, the transferee should have acted in *good faith* and taken *reasonable care* to ascertain that the transferor had the power to make the transfer, in order to take benefit of Section 41 of the TPA. To demonstrate that the Applicants 1, 3, 4 and 6 had acted in *good faith* and taken *reasonable care* to ascertain authority of the transferor to make the transfer, Applicants 1 and 2 have submitted that the impugned properties were purchased after conducting due diligence, including verification of the land revenue records reflecting the name of the seller *(predecessor-in-title)* and the sale transaction undertaken through registered Sale Deeds with proper payment of required stamp duties and registration fees.

34. As noted in the above paras, considering that Sale Deeds appear to be exclusively executed in the individual name of Mr. Gurpreet Singh (*predecessor in title of the Objectors/Applicants)* and the corresponding land revenue records also reflect the properties in his individual name, with no indication of any title/claim/interest in favor of PACL or any of its associates, it can clearly be seen that the Objectors/Applicants could not have reasonably known or been expected to know of any alleged link between the impugned properties and PACL. However, the existence of a beneficial interest of PACL in the hands of its associate does not, by itself, defeat the rights of a subsequent bona fide purchaser who satisfies the requirements of Section 41 of the Transfer of Property Act. The Objectors/Applicants having verified the chain of title and the land revenue records in respect of the aforesaid impugned properties prior to purchase, can be said to have exercised *due diligence*, taken *reasonable care* and acted in *good faith* while acquiring the impugned properties. Accordingly, the Objectors/Applicants' purchase falls squarely within the protection afforded under Section 41 of the TPA.

35. Here, reference is drawn to the order dated February 19, 2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court wherein, while directing that the Category B applications i.e. the 106 applications filed against the order/recommendation passed by Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) be dealt with by the Recovery Officers appointed under Section 28A of the SEBI Act, 1992, the Hon'ble Supreme Court specifically has stated as under:

> *"12. In view of the fact that the said applications are pending for a lone time, we accordingly direct:*
>
> ……….
>
> *(iii) The remit of the Recovery Officers shall be confined to determining whether the properties subject matter of such applications, were in fact purchased by PACL Limited or relatable to its associate entities, subsidiaries or sister concerns and whether the Applicants establish, on the basis of documentary materials & evidence, that the properties are held by them in their independent capacity.*

………

(vi) A party will not be denied a claim over a property solely for the reason, that at one point and time the property was owned by PACL or its associated entities and it is not clear as to what were the source of funds used by PACL & its sister entities, as the case may be, to purchase the properties, if otherwise it is clear that the party is a bonafide purchaser for value having actually paid the amounts through banking channels.

……..”

36. In view of the aforesaid directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the documents available on record, it is established that Applicants 1, 3, 4 and 6 had acquired the impugned properties from Mr. Gurpreet Singh vide various sale deeds, all dated March 25, 2013, for consideration which has been paid through banking channels via various cheques as well as cash, as mentioned in the preceding para nos. 17 and 22. Further, as can be seen from the aforementioned observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the order dated February 19, 2026, it can be understood that even the Apex Court has directed that claims over a property are liable to be protected where it is evident that the claimant is a *bona fide* purchaser for value who has actually paid the consideration through legitimate means such as banking channels. Though the Hon'ble Supreme Court has referred to transactions through banking channels as an indicator of *bona fide* purchase, the said observation cannot be read as excluding genuine transactions undertaken, particularly where the transfer is evidenced through registered instruments, corresponding revenue entries and long-standing possession. In the present case, the genuineness of the transaction in respect of the impugned properties stands established through the existence of a duly registered instrument i.e. the respective sale deeds all dated March 25, 2013, payment of valuable consideration and proof of peaceful possession. The Objectors/Applicants has produced the duly registered Sale Deeds, thereby confirming the legality and validity of the transfer. The requirement of valuable consideration also stands satisfied as the Sale Deed itself records the payment details, and the vendor has expressly acknowledged receipt of the entire sale consideration in cheque and/or cash within the recitals of the registered instrument. Furthermore, the provided bank statements clearly show payments made through various cheques as mentioned in the respective Sale Deeds. While Applicants 1 and 6 did not produce documentary evidence for the part-payments made via their PNB bank and Central bank of India bank accounts, respectively, there is nothing on record to show any dispute or claim being made by the vendor for non-receipt of any of the sale consideration. It is further pertinent to note that the sale transactions by the Applicants 1 and 6 in the impugned properties were executed and registered well prior to SEBI order dated August 22, 2014, wherein PACL and its Promoters/Directors were prohibited from alienating their properties except for the purpose of refunding its investors.

37. With regard to the fact that certain sale consideration for the said transactions has been done in cash, it is noteworthy to refer to judgment dated September 01, 2025 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Georgekutty Chacko vs. M.N. Saji (civil appeal no.11309 of 2025)***, wherein the Court has observed as under:

> *"...it is not uncommon that in money transactions, there is a component of cash also involved and just because a person is not able to prove the transfer through official modes i.e., through any negotiable instrument or bank transaction, would not lead to the conclusion that such amount was not paid through cash especially when there was a categorical statement to this effect by the appellant before the Court concerned. Moreover, the initial presumption of legally enforceable debt comes from the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 also and thus the onus is on the respondent to prove that no such amount was given."*
>
> ……….
>
> *Only because documentary proof was not available, we find such view taken to be erroneous. A person who gives cash obviously would not be having any documentary proof per se. Sometimes there may be an occasion where even for a cash transaction, a receipt is taken, but absence of the same would not negate and disprove the stand that the cash transaction also took place between the parties."*

38. Applying the aforesaid principle to the present case, the payment made in cash by the Applicants/Objectors in year 2013 cannot, by itself, be treated as suspicious or non-genuine. As observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above judgement, the absence of a bank transaction does not disprove a transaction when a categorical statement is made by the parties.

Here, the vendor viz. Mr. Gurpreet Singh has expressly acknowledged the receipt of the entire considerations in the recitals of the respective Sale Deeds. Further, there is nothing on record to show any dispute/ complaint/ongoing litigation challenging the non-receipt of the sale consideration.

39. Further, while no documentary evidence has been produced for the payment of land tax, in the light of the foregoing and the documentary evidences placed on record the fact remains that the Applicants are *bonafide* purchasers who acquired the impugned properties through a registered Sale Deed and paid the sale consideration through cheques and/or cash. Consequently, they have taken possession of the land, and their names have been duly mutated in the revenue records. Therefore, the observations made in preceding para no. 23 would not disturb the *bonafide* title of Applicants to the impugned properties in the light of the title documents available on record. In view of the same, the Panel is of the view that the Objectors' claim w.r.t the impugned properties deserve to be allowed and the impugned order dated September 05, 2019 passed by Mr. R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) is liable to be set aside.

40. It is pertinent to note here that, as submitted, out of the larger land parcels acquired by Applicant 1, 3, 4 and 6 from Mr. Gurpreet Singh, these Applicants have subsequently subdivided and sold majority of these land parcels to different individual buyers. As a consequence of these successive transactions, the said Applicants currently retain and have claimed only a small residual portion out of the acquired property, details of which are as under:

Applicant	**Land originally acquired**	**Impugned property(ies)**
Applicant 1: Mr. Laxman Singh	➢ Khasra No. 351 admeasuring 0.0800 Hectares ➢ Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 0.0740 Hectares	➢ Khasra No. 351 admeasuring 89.38 sqm (0.008938 Hectares), ➢ Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 78.58 sqm (0.007858 Hectares).

	Originally acquired by Applicants 1 from Mr. Gurpreet Singh via a registered Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013.	Total area: 167.96 sqm (0.016796 Hectares).
Applicant 3: Mr. Bijendra Singh **Applicant 4:** Mr. Himmat Singh Rana	➢ Khasra No. 343 admeasuring 0.1980 Hectares Originally acquired by Applicants 3 and 4 from Mr. Gurpreet Singh via a registered Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013.	➢ Khasra No. 343 admeasuring 21.09 sqm (0.002109 Hectares).
Applicant 6: Mr. Prem Singh	➢ Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 0.1090 Hectares, ➢ Khasra No. 341 admeasuring 0.0185 Hectares and ➢ Khasra no. 342 admeasuring 0.0530 Hectares Originally acquired by Applicants 6 from Mr. Gurpreet Singh via a registered Sale Deed dated March 25, 2013.	Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 31 sqm (0.0031 Hectares), Khasra No. 341 admeasuring 03 sqm (0.0003 Hectares), Khasra No. 342 admeasuring 128 sqm (0.0128 Hectares). Total area: 162 sqm (0.0162 Hectares).

41. Furthermore, with regard to the specific claim of Applicants 2, 5 and 7, it is established that they have acquired the impugned properties directly/indirectly from Applicants 1, 3, 4 and 6 via separate registered Sale Deeds. Since it is established in the preceding paragraphs that Applicants 1, 3, 4 and 6 held a valid title to the impugned properties, the subsequent sale of portion of such impugned properties to Applicants 2, 5 and 7 cannot be said to be bad in law. The details of the properties are as under:

Applicant	**Land originally aquired**	**Impugned property(ies)**
Applicant 2: Mrs. Leela Pokhriyal	➢ Khasra No. 351 admeasuring 0.016725 Hectares Originally acquired by Applicants 2 from Mr. Manish Chhetri and Mrs. Shivani Chhetri via a registered Sale Deed	➢ Khasra No. 351 min admeasuring 147 sqm (0.0147 Hectares).

	February 25, 2015, who had acquired the same from Applicants 1 via a registered Sale Deed dated October 24, 2013.	
Applicant 5: Mrs. Rakhi w/o Mr. Vijay Prakash	➢ Khasra No. 343 admeasuring 62.08 sqm (0.006208 Hectares) Originally acquired by Applicants 5 from Applicants 3 and 4 via a registered Sale Deed dated December 13, 2013.	➢ Khasra No. 343 admeasuring 62.08 sqm (0.006208 Hectares).
Applicant 7: Mrs. Kalpeshwari Navani	➢ Khasra Nos. 353 admeasuring 391.65 sqm (0.039165 Hectares) Originally acquired by Applicants 7 from Applicants 6 via a registered Sale Deed dated September 16, 2013.	Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 219 sqm (0.0219 Hectares).

42. With regard to the claim made by Applicant 1 for the land at Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 78.58 sqm (0.007858 Hectares), as detailed in the preceding para nos. 25 and 26, the specified property is not included in the restricted or banned Khasra/Property list maintained by the Stamp and Registration Department of the Government of Uttarakhand. Considering that there is nothing on record to show any attachment of the said property by the Committee, the question of its release from attachment does not arise. Consequently, the objection so far as it relates to the said property viz. Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 78.58 sqm (0.007858 Hectares), is liable to be disposed of without any direction.

ORDER:

43. Given the above facts, the objection raised by Applicants with respect to the following impugned properties is liable to be allowed and is accordingly, allowed:

Applicant	**Plot description**
1. Mr. Laxman Singh	Khasra No. 351 admeasuring 89.38 sqm (0.008938 Hectares).
2. Mrs. Leela Pokhriyal	Khasra No. 351 min admeasuring 147 sqm (0.0147 Hectares).
3. Mr. Bijendra Singh 4. Mr. Himmat Singh Rana	Khasra No. 343 admeasuring 21.09 sqm (0.002109 Hectares).

वसूली अधिकारियों का पैनल Panel of Recovery Officers पी ए सी एल लि. के मामले से संबंधित, मुंबई/In the matter of Pacl Ltd. Mumbai

K.R.

Applicant	Plot description
5. Mrs. Rakhi w/o Mr. Vijay Prakash	Khasra No. 343 admeasuring 62.08 sqm (0.006208 Hectares).
6. Mr. Prem Singh	Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 31 sqm (0.0031 Hectares), Khasra No. 341 admeasuring 03 sqm (0.0003 Hectares), Khasra No. 342 admeasuring 128 sqm (0.0128 Hectares). Total area: 162 sqm (0.0162 Hectares).
7. Mrs. Kalpeshwari Navani	Khasra No. 353 admeasuring 219 sqm (0.0219 Hectares).

44. In view thereof, the impugned order dated September 05, 2019 passed by Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.), to the extent of the aforementioned Khasra Nos., is hereby set aside.

45. Further, with regards to the objection raised by Applicant 1 with respect to attachment of land at Khasra No. 352 admeasuring 78.58 sqm (0.007858 Hectares), the same is hereby disposed of without any direction.

Place: Mumbai
Date: July 31, 2026

On behalf of panel of Recovery Officers
(in the matter of PACL Ltd.)

31.07.2026 — **MS. RESHMA GOEL** — **RECOVERY OFFICER**

रेशमा गोयल / RESHMA GOEL
उप महाप्रबंधक एवं वसूली अधिकारी
Deputy General Manager & Recovery Officer
(पी ए सी एल ली के मामले से संबंधित, मुंबई)/(In the matter of PACL Ltd. Mumbai)

31.07.2026 — **MR. BAL KISHOR MANDAL** — **RECOVERY OFFICER**

बाल किशोर मंडल / BAL KISHOR MANDAL
उप महाप्रबंधक एवं वसूली अधिकारी
Deputy General Manager & Recovery Officer
(पी ए सी एल ली के मामले से संबंधित) [In the matter of PACL Ltd.]

31.07.2026 — **MS. PREETI PATEL** — **RECOVERY OFFICER**

प्रीति पटेल / PREETI PATEL
उप महाप्रबंधक एवं वसूली अधिकारी
Deputy General Manager & Recovery Officer
(पी ए सी एल ली के मामले से संबंधित, मुंबई)/(In the Matter of PACL Ltd. Mumbai)

वसूली अधिकारियों का पैनल Panel of Recovery Officers (पी ए सी एल ली के मामले से संबंधित, मुंबई) In the matter of Pacl Ltd.