

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

W.P. No. 23048/2024

(DR. AJAI LALL VS. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS)

Dated : 02-09-2024

Shri V.K. Tankha and Shri Shashank Shekhar – Senior Advocates with Shri Bhoopesh Tiwari – Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Harpreet Ruprah – Additional Advocate General and Shri B.D. Singh – Deputy Advocate General for the respondents-State.

Shri Akash Choudhary and Shri Vishal Daniel – Advocates for intervenor.

Shri A. Parikh and Shri Akshat Arjaria – Advocates for the respondent No.5.

Pursuant to the information conveyed to the Court by the Office of Advocate General that the petitioner Dr. Ajai Lall is absconding and has left the country despite the interim order directing him not to leave the country without the permission of this Court. Though, it was reserved for orders but directed to be listed in the Court.

Shri V.K. Tankha and Shri Shashank Shekhar, learned Senior Counsels along with the petitioner in person appeared in the Court so as to convince the Court that the information which has been conveyed by the Office of Advocate General was not correct. It is nothing but an action by the Superintendent of Police just to harass the petitioner.

Shri Ruprah, learned Additional Advocate General appearing along with Shri B.D. Singh, learned Deputy Advocate General submits that they have received authentic information, therefore, they conveyed the same to

the Court because they are under an obligation to do so and that it is nothing but an action of the petitioner for violating the order of the Court.

Considering the submissions and taking note of the presence of the petitioner in the Court in person along with his passport, I discharge his presence and taking note of the affidavit submitted by the petitioner, this Court finds no action is required to be taken on the information conveyed by the Office of Advocate General as the same is incorrect. The Office of Advocate General is directed to file an affidavit before this Court so as to apprise this Court as to what was the source of the information which was conveyed to them and finally that information was found to be incorrect. If Court may think so, an action may be taken against the person who has conveyed the wrong information to the Office of Advocate General.

Further, considering the submissions and on perusal of the affidavit, Shri Ruprah, Additional Advocate General is directed to seek information from the source who has conveyed this information as to what was the foundation of such information and who has conveyed this information to the Office of Advocate General so that an appropriate action may be taken against the concerned officer.

The matter be still treated as heard and reserved.

(SANJAY DWIVEDI)
JUDGE

PK