BEFORE THE PANEL OF RECOVERY OFFICERS APPOINTED UNDER SECTION 28A OF THE SEBI ACT, 1992 DISCHARGING FUNCTIONS IN TERMS OF THE ORDERS OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT DATED 08.08.2024 AND 19.02.2026 IN C.A. No. 13301 OF 2015 IN THE MATTER OF PACL LTD.

Interlocutory Application No.	189566 of 2025, 189575 of 2025 and 189576 of 2025
File No.	SEBI/PACL/IA/KW/00732/2026
Name of the Objector(s)/Applicant	Mr. Mohit Aggarwal
MR No.	12087/16

Background:

1. The Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as "SEBI") on 22.08.2014 passed an order against Pearls Agrotech Corporation Limited (hereinafter referred to as "PACL Ltd."), 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. By 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.

2. The aforesaid order was challenged by PACL Ltd. and its directors by filing appeals before the Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as "SAT"). Vide its order dated 12.08.2015, the said appeals were dismissed by Hon'ble SAT, with a direction to the appellants to refund the amounts collected from the investors within three months. Aggrieved by the aforesaid order dated 12.08.2015, PACL Ltd. and its directors filed appeals before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

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

3. The Hon'ble Supreme Court did not grant any stay on the aforesaid impugned order dated 12.08.2015 of Hon'ble SAT, however, PACL Ltd. and its promoters/directors did not refund the money to its investors. Accordingly, SEBI initiated recovery proceedings under Section 28A of SEBI Act, 1992 against PACL Ltd. and its promoters/directors vide recovery certificate no. 832 of 2015 drawn on 11.12.2015 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 11.12.2015.

4. During the course of hearing on the aforesaid civil appeals filed by PACL Ltd. and its directors (i.e. *Civil Appeal No. 13301 of 2015 – Subrata Bhattacharya Vs. SEBI* and other connected matters), the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 02.02.2016, directed SEBI to constitute a committee under the Chairmanship of Hon'ble 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, direction for refund and direction regarding restraint on the PACL Ltd. and its promoters and directors from disposing, alienating or selling the assets of the PACL Ltd., as given in the order continue 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 of interest.

6. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 25.07.2016 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

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

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 3 above, the Recovery Officer issued an attachment order dated 07.09.2016, 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 document 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 15.11.2017 passed in C.A. No.13301/2015 and connected matters directed that all the grievances or objections pertaining to properties of PACL Ltd. would be taken up by Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retired).

9. On 30.04.2019, in the recovery proceedings initiated against PACL Ltd. & Ors., the Recovery Officer issued a notice of attachment in respect of 25 front companies of PACL Ltd. Thereafter, on 01.03.2021, 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 30.04.2019.

10. The Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 08.08.2024, in Civil Appeal No. 13301 of 2015 – Subrata Bhattacharya Vs. SEBI and other connected matters, 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*

Panel of Recovery Officers In the matter of Pacl Ltd Mumbai *dispose them of as per the provisions contained under Section-28(A) of the SEBI Act….."*

11. In compliance with aforesaid order dated 08.08.2024 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, all objections with respect to properties of PACL Ltd., which were pending before Judge Virk 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 an order dated 19.02.2026 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, challenging the recommendations of Judge Virk, 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 Panel of Recovery Officers appointed under Section 28A of the SEBI Act, 1992 for discharging functions in terms of the Orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 08.08.2024 and 19.02.2026 in C.A. No. 13301 of 2015 in the matter of PACL Ltd.

Proceedings before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.)

13. Shri Mohit Aggarwal (hereinafter referred to as the "**Applicant**") had filed an Objection petition (File No.695) before Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) seeking *inter alia* release from attachment of the land comprised in Khasra Nos. 3263क and 3288ज total admeasuring 0.0815 Hectares (hereinafter referred to as "**impugned properties**") situated at Village Hukumatpur, Tehsil Vikas Nagar, District Dehradun, Uttarakhand, from the list of properties sought to be auctioned by the Committee. The said impugned properties are seized under MR No. 12087/16 and attached by the Committee.

14. The Applicant had purchased the impugned properties for a consideration of Rs.25,00,000/- from one Shri Rajiv Kumar vide registered sale deed no. 3941/2015

dated 07.05.2015 who in turn had purchased the same from one Shri Abdul Salam vide registered sale deed no.4655/2006 dated 22.06.2006. The Applicant had filed the aforesaid objection petition *inter alia* on the ground that he had purchased the impugned properties as a *bona fide* purchaser, was in possession of the same and had clear title over the impugned properties as mutation no. 00907 was sanctioned in his name by virtue of order dated 16.11.2015 passed by Assistant Collector-I, Vikas Nagar, Dehradun in case no. 02/15-16 titled *Mohit Aggarwal vs Gram Sabha*.

15. Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retired), vide Order dated 05.02.2020, dismissed the Objection Petition *inter alia* on the ground that:

i. The ledger accounts produced by PACL before him revealed that a 'land advance' of Rs.3,26,000/- as cost of land, Rs.32,600/- as stamp duty and Rs.5,810/- as registration charges, was paid by PACL to Shri Rajiv Kumar for purchase of impugned properties.

ii. There was no material available on record to suggest that the impugned properties were purchased by Shri Rajiv Kumar out of his own funds.

iii. The sanctioning of mutation no. 00907 pursuant to order dated 16.11.2015 passed by Assistant Collector-I, Vikas Nagar, Dehradun in case no.02/15-16 titled *Mohit Aggarwal vs Gram Sabha* could not be considered as it is settled law that mutation does not confer any title in the property.

16. Aggrieved by the aforesaid dismissal, the Applicant filed a Review Application *inter alia* on the ground that the Applicant had purchased the impugned properties in a *bona fide* manner vide registered sale deed and made payment through proper banking channels which was a more conclusive proof of ownership compared to a ledger produced by PACL which was only a computer typed fake and bogus document having no legal sanctity.

17. However, Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retired), vide Order dated 24.12.2020, dismissed the Review Application as well *inter alia* on the ground that Sale Deed No. 4655/2006 dated 22.06.2006 pertaining to purchase of impugned properties by Shri

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

Rajiv Kumar from Shri Abdul Salam, was recovered by CBI from the possession of PACL and when viewed in the context of ledger entries produced by PACL, which showed payment of 'land advance' to Shri Rajiv Kumar for purchase of impugned properties, the same gives an inference of ownership in favour of PACL *qua* the impugned properties.

Present Interlocutory Application (IA)

18. Aggrieved by the dismissal of both i.e. the objection petition and review application, the Applicant filed an Interlocutory Application No. 189566 of 2025 seeking intervention, Interlocutory Application No. 189575 of 2025 seeking directions and Interlocutory Application No. 189576 of 2025 for exemption from filing official translations of annexures (collectively referred to as "**IAs**") before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in C.A. No. 13301/2015 *Subrata Bhattacharya vs. SEBI* (supra) praying *inter alia* for setting aside of Order/Recommendation dated 05.02.2020 and 24.12.2020 (hereinafter referred to as "**impugned orders**") of Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.) and an *ad-interim* stay on the auction of impugned properties. In the said IAs, it is *inter alia* contended by the Applicant:

i. That the Applicant is a *bona fide* purchaser whose rights are protected under Section 41 read with Section 53A of the Transfer of Property Act.

ii. That the Applicant had exercised reasonable care and conducted due diligence in ascertaining that the Vendor had the power to transfer the impugned properties.

iii. That Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retired) held the Sale Deed dated 07.05.2015 as not a *bona fide* document merely on the basis of ledger entries produced by PACL whose veracity or authenticity were not discussed or proved by PACL.

iv. That the Sale Deed No. 4655/2006 dated 22.06.2006 which was seized by CBI from the possession of PACL and subsequently handed over to the Committee was never provided to the Applicant at any stage of proceedings before Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retired).

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

19. Thereafter, as stated above, the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 19.02.2026 in the matter of *Subrata Bhattacharya vs. SEBI (Civil Appeal No. 13301 of 2015) inter alia* directed, that all Interlocutory Applications/Transferred Case falling under Category B, i.e. 106 sets of applications including the instant application, challenging 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.

20. In compliance with the aforesaid order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the proceedings in respect of the IAs were initiated by the Panel of Recovery Officers and accordingly, the Applicant was granted an opportunity of hearing on 27.04.2026 wherein the Applicant appeared physically before the Panel of Recovery Officers and made submissions on the lines of averments made in the IAs and also submitted brief written submissions and placed reliance on various judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court to support his contentions. Based on the submissions made during the hearing, the AR of the Applicant was *inter alia* advised to submit:

i. Encumbrance Certificate
ii. Land Tax Payment receipts, up to date;
iii. Village Map area layout;

21. Accordingly, the following documents *inter alia* were submitted by the AR of the Applicant vide email dated 04.05.2026:

i. Khasra Khatauni of the impugned properties which is equivalent to Encumbrance Certificate in Uttarakhand;
ii. Village Map area layout;
iii. Site photos of the impugned properties ;
iv. Electricity Bill and Receipts in respect of the impugned properties;
v. Multi-Commodity Form 6R issued by Vikas Nagar Mandi in favour of the Applicant for agricultural produce procured from the impugned properties.

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

22. Other than the documents provided by the AR and those annexed to the IA, the Panel of Recovery Officers also have on record, the documents seized by the CBI under the MR. No. 12087/16 from the possession of PACL and thereafter attached by the Committee. The details of the documents seized are as under:

Mr. No. – 12087/16					
Sr. No	**Document No.**	**Executed by**	**In Favour**	**Extent**	**Consideration**
1.	Sale Deed no. 4655/06 dated 22.06.2006 (Registered)	Shri Abdul Salam	Shri Rajiv Kumar	Khasra no. – 3263क, Area – 0.0195 hectare, Khasra no. – 3288ज Area – 0.0620 hectare Total area of Khasra no. is 0.0815 hectare Situated at – Mouza Shankarpur, Hukumatahpur, Paragana Pachhuvadoon, Tehsil Vikasnagar, District Dehradun	Rs. 3,26,000/-

23. The Panel has perused the aforesaid documents, the IA and its annexures and the written submissions. The Applicant has submitted that the Applicant is the sole and absolute owner of the impugned properties having purchased them from Shri Rajeev Kumar vide a registered sale deed dated 07.05.2015, who in turn had acquired the same vide registered sale deed dated 22.06.2006. It is noted that Shri Rajeev Kumar, vide declaration letter dated 17.12.2019, *inter alia,* affirmed that the impugned properties were purchased through a duly registered sale deed after verification of the title and for valid consideration which was subsequently transferred to the Applicant thereby establishing the clear and continuous chain of title. The Applicant further submitted that he has paid a consideration of Rs. 25,00,000/- (Rs. 23,44,000/- as market value, Rs. 1,21,000/- as stamp duty and Rs. 10,270 towards registration fees) through banking channels. Further, the revenue records were also mutated in favour of the Applicant on 16.11.2015 by the Assistant Collector – I, Vikasnagar.

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

24. From the aforesaid documents, it is observed that the impugned properties were purchased by Shri Rajiv Kumar from Shri Abdul Salam through a Sale Deed No.4655/2006 dated 22.06.2006 and for a consideration of Rs.3,26,000/- (paid in cash) which was duly registered in the office of Indras Sub Registrar, Vikasnagar, at Book no.1, volume 633 pages 5 A.D.F.1 Volume 699 pages 352 to 362 at Serial no. 1025 on 14.02.2006. Thereafter, vide Sale Deed No.3941/2015 dated 07.05.2015, the impugned properties were sold by Shri Rajiv Kumar to the Applicant for a sale consideration of Rs.25,00,000/- that was paid on 14.05.2015 through Cheque No.0850052 of State Bank of India, Prem Nagar, Dehradun as evident from the Bank Statement (Annexure A-3 to the IA for directions) submitted by the Applicant. The Encumbrance Certificate (Khasra Khatauni) submitted by the Applicant reflects the change of title of impugned properties from Shri Rajiv Kumar to the Applicant.

25. Before proceeding further, the Panel considers it necessary that in order to adjudicate the claims made by the Applicant, it would be pertinent to first understand the *modus operandi* adopted by PACL which has been enunciated in the order dated 22.08.2014 passed by SEBI, wherein it is observed 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*

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

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*)

26. Further, it is pertinent to refer to the admission made by PACL in the aforesaid order wherein it had admitted that for the purpose of its business, it was buying lands through its agents. The relevant paragraph is reproduced hereunder:

"………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)

27. In view of the aforesaid admission of PACL and considering the fact that Sale Deed no.4655/2006 dated 22.06.2006 (*under MR. No.12076/16*) was seized by the CBI from the possession of PACL, it is inferred that the purchaser in the said sale deed namely, Shri Rajiv Kumar, had purchased the impugned properties mentioned therein on behalf of PACL as its agent/employee/associate, as PACL was unable to own lands in its own name beyond certain limits due to the land laws of the country. The said inference also gains strength in view of the ledger accounts produced by PACL before Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retired) wherein payments for 'land advance' were made by PACL to Shri Rajiv Kumar for purchase of impugned properties. Therefore, it becomes certain that the actual beneficial owner of the impugned properties was none other than PACL.

28. However, even if Shri Rajiv Kumar was an agent of PACL, the fact that he has further transferred the impugned properties to the Applicant for consideration, cannot be ignored as the same has resulted in creation of third party rights which are protected under Section 41 of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882 ("**TPA**") that states 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.*

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

29. Reference herein may also be made to the observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para 12 (vi) of its order dated 19.02.2026, wherein it has stated that:

> *"12. In view of the fact that the said appeals are pending for a long time, we accordingly direct:*
> *(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 bona fide purchaser for value having actually paid the amounts through banking channels."*

30. Referring to the above provision of Section 41 and para 12(vi) of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, even if PACL, as alleged by it before Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retd.), purchased the impugned properties and did not sell it to the Applicant, the rights of the Applicant as a *bona fide* purchaser are protected under law.

31. It can be argued that by virtue of the aforesaid provision, PACL as well as the Committee cannot question the transfer made in favour of the Applicant. In terms of the order dated 02.02.2016, passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Committee has been authorized for selling the properties of PACL 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 bona fides of the transferee, without being bound by or without any reference to Section 41 of TPA.

32. Assuming without admitting that the transfer of impugned properties made by Shri Rajiv Kumar in favour of the Applicant attracts Section 41 of the TPA and thus, prohibits even the Committee, even then, under the said provisions itself a transfer

पैनल Panel of Recovery Officers
वसूली अधिकारियों का पैनल संबंधित, मुंबई/In the matter of Pacl Ltd, Mumbai

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 Applicant had acted in good faith and taken reasonable care to ascertain authority of the transferor to make the transfer, the Applicant has submitted that the impugned properties were purchased through registered sale deeds after conducting due diligence, including verification of the mutation entries and revenue records reflecting the name of previous owner.

33. In this regard, the Panel of Recovery Officers have also taken note of the contention of AR that the Applicant had carried out due diligence of the title documents and revenue records prior to purchasing the impugned properties which were not in the name of PACL at the relevant point in time. The Applicant has *inter alia* asserted that he is the *bona fide* purchaser of the impugned properties and has been in its actual possession since 2015 after they were purchased by the Applicant from Shri Rajiv Kumar.

34. Having considered the above, it is noted that even though the Sale Deed No. 4655/2006 dated 22.06.2006 was seized from the custody of PACL, the said documents depicted the chain of title of the impugned properties wherein no reference was made to any title/claim/interest in favour of PACL or its associates and therefore the Applicant could not have reasonably known or expected to have known of any alleged link between the impugned properties and PACL. The Applicant having verified the chain of title, mutation entries and 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 through registered sale deeds. Accordingly, the

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

Applicant's purchase falls squarely within the protection afforded under Section 41 of the TPA.

35. At this juncture, it is pertinent to recall the observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in paragraph 12 (vi) of its order dated 19.02.2026 wherein payment through banking channels has been stated as an indicator of *bona fide* purchase. Since, in the present case, the Applicant has made the entire payment of sale consideration of Rs.25,00,000/- to Shri Rajiv Kumar through Cheque, the requirement under paragraph 12 (vi) of Hon'ble Supreme Court's order dated 19.02.2026 also stands satisfied. Further, there is nothing on record to show any dispute/complaint/ongoing litigation challenging the non-receipt of sale consideration between the Applicant and the vendor Shri Rajiv Kumar. Therefore, the Panel is of the view that the claims of the Applicants w.r.t the impugned properties deserve to be allowed.

36. In the light of the foregoing and the documentary evidence placed on record, the Panel is of the considered view that the Applicant has satisfactorily established that:

i. the impugned properties are held by him in his independent capacity, within the meaning of para 12(iii) of the order dated 19.02.2026 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court;

ii. he is *bona fide* purchaser for value who acquired the impugned properties vide registered sale deed and paid entire consideration through banking channels to the vendor, Shri Rajiv Kumar;

iii. he had conducted due diligence, including verification of the chain of registered title documents and of revenue records at the time of purchase of impugned properties;

iv. he had obtained mutation in the Khasra Khatauni/Encumbrance Certificate after purchase of impugned properties.

37. Considering the aforesaid facts, circumstances and directions in the Hon'ble Supreme Court's order dated 19.02.2026, this Panel is satisfied that the Applicant has established its status as *bona fide* purchaser and his claim over the impugned properties cannot be rejected merely on the ground that the impugned properties were owned, at an earlier point of time, by PACL or its related entities. In view thereof, the orders dated 05.02.2020 and 24.12.2020 passed by Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retired) are liable to be set aside.

ORDER:

38. For the reasons enumerated above, the Interlocutory Application Nos. 189566 of 2025, 189575 of 2025 and 189576 of 2025 filed by the Applicant viz. Mr. Mohit Agarwal are liable to be allowed and are hereby allowed in respect of the impugned properties comprised in Khasra Nos. 3263क and 3288ज total admeasuring 0.0815 Hectares situated at Village Hukumatpur, Tehsil Vikas Nagar, District Dehradun, Uttarakhand.

39. In view thereof, the orders dated 05.02.2020 and 24.12.2020 passed by Shri R. S. Virk, District Judge (Retired) are hereby set aside.

Place: Mumbai
Date: 17.08.2026

17/8/2026	17.08.2026	17.8.26
KSHAMA P. WAGHERKAR	**RESHMA GOEL**	**SAROJ KUMAR SAHU**
Recovery Officer	**Recovery Officer**	**Recovery Officer**