

आर्यन उरगलिया

अधिवक्ता

मध्यप्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय, जबलपुर



सम्पर्क : 7898799317

ईमेल : Aryanmphcba4970@gmail.com

कार्यालय पता : 308, अप्रिंत अपार्टमेंट्स, नागराज चौक,
सिविल लाइन्स, जबलपुर, म.प्र., 482001

LEGAL NOTICE

To,

Shri Sanjay Satyendra Pathak, MLA

Owner / The Editor / Editor-in-Chief / Publisher

Yashbharat.com News Portal

Office of Yashbharat.com News Portal

Kachahri Chowk, Opposite MGM Hospital

District Katni, Madhya Pradesh – 483501

Date: 10 August 2026

Subject: Legal Notice calling upon you to forthwith remove the defamatory, false and misleading publication dated 08.08.2026 concerning Shri Mahendra Goyenka; publish an unconditional apology and prominent clarification; compensate my client for grave reputational and consequential injury by payment of **₹5,00,00,000/- (Rupees Five Crores only)**; preserve all electronic and documentary evidence connected with the impugned publication; and cease further publication or republication of the defamatory imputations, failing which appropriate civil, criminal, constitutional and other proceedings shall be instituted in accordance with law.

Sir,

Under instructions from and on behalf of my client, Shri Mahendra Goenka, S/o Late Sushil Kumar Goenka, R/o House No. B-25, Kachna Road, Anandam World City, Kachna, Raipur, Chhattisgarh – 492001 (hereinafter referred to as “my Client”), I hereby address you this formal legal notice in respect of the publication disseminated by you through Yashbharat.com on 08.08.2026 concerning my Client and the manner in which the order dated 07.08.2026 passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 26908/2025 has been reported and represented to the public. The publication, read as a whole and in its context, is seriously defamatory, materially misleading and



demonstrably capable of conveying an erroneous impression that allegations of fraud, cheating and conspiracy against my Client have been judicially established by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, whereas the judicial order itself does not record any such adjudication.

1. BACKGROUND AND STATUS OF THE SUPREME COURT PROCEEDING

1.1. My Client is concerned with the proceedings arising out of Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 26908/2025, titled Euro Pratik Ispat (India) Private Limited vs. Geomin Industries Private Limited & Ors.

1.2. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide order dated 07.08.2026, dealt with the proceedings then pending before it and directed the Commercial Court, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, to consider and decide the application preferred under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, within the period stipulated by the Hon'ble Court.

1.3. The said order further provided for continuation of the interim directions already operating until the Commercial Court takes a decision on the said application. The legal effect of the order, therefore, is required to be understood in the precise terms in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court has passed it and not by attributing to the order findings, observations or conclusions which are conspicuously absent from the judicial record.

1.4. Most significantly, and this aspect is of decisive importance, paragraph 4 of the order dated 07.08.2026 specifically records that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the dispute and that the matter remains to be adjudicated by the competent Commercial Court in accordance with law. The order, therefore, cannot by any fair, reasonable or legally sustainable interpretation be represented as a final adjudication of the underlying commercial dispute or as a judicial declaration that my Client committed fraud, cheating, forgery or conspiracy.



1.5. Paragraph 5 of the said order further preserves the rights and contentions of the parties before the competent Commercial Court. The controversy, insofar as its merits are concerned, consequently remains open for adjudication before the forum designated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

1.6. In these circumstances, any journalistic presentation which suggests, expressly or by necessary implication, that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has finally found my client guilty of fraud or conspiracy, or that the underlying dispute has been conclusively decided against him, constitutes a serious distortion of the judicial record and cannot be defended as a mere difference in journalistic expression.

2. THE IMPUGNED PUBLICATION

2.1. My Client has learnt that on 08.08.2026, your web portal, Yashbharat.com, published and circulated an article concerning my client under the following headline:

“धोखाधड़ी के आरोपी महेन्द्र गोयंका को 1.70 लाख मैट्रिक टन आयरन और विवाद में सुप्रीम

कोर्ट ने भी नहीं दी कोई रियायत...”

2.2. The said publication further contains, inter alia, the following categorical imputation concerning my Client:

“महेन्द्र गोयनका ने पिछले तीन सालों में हर स्तर पर की धोखाधड़ी और रची साजिश...”

2.3. The aforesaid expressions, particularly when placed in the headline and juxtaposed with the reference to the Hon'ble Supreme Court, are not capable of being understood by an ordinary reader as a neutral narration of an allegation which remains sub judice. The natural and inevitable impression conveyed is that my Client has been judicially branded or confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as a person who committed fraud and hatched a conspiracy.



2.4. Such an impression is contrary to the actual legal position emerging from the order dated 07.08.2026. The publication thus does not merely suffer from imprecision; it materially alters the apparent effect of a judicial order and thereby exposes my Client to serious and continuing reputational injury.

3. THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT HAS NOT RECORDED ANY FINDING OF FRAUD, CHEATING, FORGERY OR CONSPIRACY AGAINST MY CLIENT.

3.1. It is specifically pointed out that the order dated 07.08.2026 does not constitute, and cannot lawfully be described as, a final judicial finding that my client committed fraud, committed cheating, forged any document, entered into any conspiracy, committed any offence, or was otherwise culpable in respect of the allegations forming part of the underlying dispute.

3.2. Equally importantly, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has expressly refrained from entering into the merits of the controversy and has left the adjudication of the dispute to the competent Commercial Court. The rights and contentions of the parties have also been preserved.

3.3. The impugned publication, however, suppresses this crucial legal distinction and presents the proceedings in a manner calculated, or at the very least reasonably capable, of leading a reader to believe that the highest Court of the land has already returned a finding of fraud and conspiracy against my client. Such a representation is factually incorrect, legally misleading and gravely prejudicial.

3.4. It is a matter of elementary legal reporting that a judicial order must be reported in accordance with its actual operative effect and the findings expressly recorded therein. A report cannot attribute to a Court a finding which the Court has neither recorded nor intended to record. The distinction between an allegation, an argument, an interim



observation, a direction concerning an interlocutory application and a final adjudication on merits is fundamental. Your publication, in the present case, obliterates that distinction to the manifest prejudice of my client.

4. MISLEADING REPRESENTATION THAT THE MATTER WAS 'DISMISSED' AGAINST MY CLIENT

4.1. The impugned publication further conveys, in substance, that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has passed a major decision and has 'dismissed' the case of Shri Mahendra Goyenka. The manner in which the report is worded gives the reader an impression that the underlying commercial controversy has been finally determined against my client on merits.

4.2. Such a presentation is materially misleading. Disposal of proceedings before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, coupled with directions concerning an application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC and continuation of existing interim directions, cannot be equated with a final adjudication of the underlying commercial dispute. More particularly, where the order itself expressly records that no opinion on merits has been expressed, it is legally impermissible to report the order as though it were a final pronouncement establishing the alleged wrongdoing of my client.

4.3. The legal consequence of an order disposing of the proceedings in the manner directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is materially different from a decree or judgment finally adjudicating the substantive rights and liabilities of the parties. Your publication has failed to maintain this essential distinction and has thereby distorted the legal effect of the order in the eyes of the general public.

5. THE DELIBERATE AND PREJUDICIAL USE OF THE EXPRESSION 'धोखाधड़ी के आरोपी'



5.1. The prominent use of the expression “धोखाधड़ी के आरोपी महेन्द्र गोयंका” in the headline is inherently prejudicial, particularly when it is followed by an assertion that my client committed fraud at every level and hatched a conspiracy. The cumulative effect of the publication is far more serious than the mere reporting of an allegation in a pending case.

5.2. A publication concerning pending judicial proceedings may be entitled to such protection as is available in law where it faithfully and fairly reports the proceedings. However, such protection cannot extend to a publication which distorts the judicial record, suppresses material qualifications contained in the order, converts allegations into established facts, or attributes to a Court a finding which the Court has not made.

5.3. The impugned headline, viewed in the context of the article as a whole, has the natural tendency to lower the estimation in which my client is held by reasonable members of society and to adversely affect his personal, social, professional and commercial standing. The publication is therefore actionable to the extent recognised by law.

6. IMPUTATIONS OF 'FRAUD AT EVERY LEVEL' AND 'CONSPIRACY' ARE SERIOUS DEFAMATORY IMPUTATIONS

6.1. The assertion that my client committed “fraud at every level” and “hatched a conspiracy” is not a neutral description of court proceedings. It is a direct imputation concerning his honesty, integrity, character and conduct.

6.2. Such imputations are particularly grave when disseminated through a news portal and presented alongside a reference to proceedings before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The ordinary reader is likely to attach enhanced credibility to the allegation merely because it is placed in the context of a Supreme Court proceeding. The resulting prejudice is therefore substantial and foreseeable.



6.3. A responsible publication is expected to distinguish between what a party has alleged, what a Court has observed, what a Court has directed, and what has ultimately been adjudicated. In the present case, the publication has failed to maintain that distinction and has thereby created a false narrative concerning the judicial status of the allegations.

6.4. In the absence of any corresponding judicial finding in the order dated 07.08.2026, attributing fraud, conspiracy or similar culpability to my Client by reference to the Hon'ble Supreme Court proceedings is impermissible and materially misleading. The continuing availability of the publication on a digital platform further aggravates the injury because the impugned statements remain capable of repeated access, sharing, indexing and republication.

7. DEFAMATION: CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSEQUENCES

7.1. The publication of an imputation concerning a person, where the requisite statutory ingredients of defamation are satisfied, may attract the offence of defamation under Section 356 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, subject always to the statutory ingredients, exceptions and other requirements prescribed by law. The present notice is not intended to prejudge any criminal proceeding; it places you on express notice of the legal consequences that may follow if the impugned publication is found to satisfy the applicable statutory requirements.

7.2. Independently of criminal liability, the publication of false and defamatory imputations causing injury to reputation may give rise to an actionable civil claim for damages, injunction and other appropriate relief. My client reserves his right to institute such proceedings before the competent forum and to place before the Court the complete publication, its circulation, readership, social-media dissemination, source material, editorial process and all surrounding circumstances.



7.3. The fact that the impugned statements have been published in a digital medium does not dilute the legal consequences of the publication. On the contrary, the continuing accessibility, searchability and potential republication of the material are relevant circumstances in assessing the extent of reputational harm and the appropriate relief.

8. MISREPRESENTATION OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS AND CONTEMPT JURISDICTION

8.1. My client is particularly aggrieved by the manner in which the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has been invoked as the apparent foundation for allegations which the order itself does not record as judicial findings. The sanctity of judicial proceedings requires that reports concerning orders of constitutional courts remain faithful to the record and do not attribute to the Court conclusions which it has expressly declined to reach.

8.2. My client reserves his right, if so advised, to place the impugned publication, the complete judicial record and the circumstances of publication before the competent constitutional Court for consideration of such remedies as may be available in law, including, where the statutory and constitutional threshold is satisfied, proceedings within the contempt jurisdiction. Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, and the applicable law governing criminal contempt may become relevant depending upon the precise nature, effect and context of the publication.

8.3. This notice does not assert that contempt is automatically made out merely by reason of an inaccurate report. Rather, you are expressly put to notice that continued or deliberate misrepresentation of a judicial order, if established in the facts and if it meets the statutory threshold, may invite appropriate scrutiny by the competent Court.



9. EXTENT OF REPUTATIONAL, PROFESSIONAL AND FINANCIAL INJURY

9.1. The impugned publication has caused and/or is reasonably capable of causing substantial and continuing injury to my client's reputation, social standing, professional and commercial reputation, business relationships, public image, credibility, goodwill and future professional and commercial opportunities. The injury is aggravated by the fact that the imputations have been disseminated through an online news portal and are capable of indefinite digital circulation.

9.2. The use of expressions imputing fraud and conspiracy, coupled with the reference to the Hon'ble Supreme Court, is of such a nature that a reasonable person acquainted with the publication may naturally infer serious wrongdoing on the part of my client. The resultant injury is neither speculative nor trivial. It is a direct and foreseeable consequence of the manner in which the publication has been presented.

9.3. In view of the nature, gravity, prominence and continuing accessibility of the impugned publication, my Client hereby calls upon you to pay a sum of ₹5,00,00,000/- (Rupees Five Crores only) towards damages/compensation for reputational injury and consequential loss, without prejudice to his right to claim enhanced, additional or consequential damages as may be established before the competent forum on the basis of evidence.

10. FORMAL DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE REMEDIAL ACTION

10.1. In the circumstances stated above, you are hereby called upon to, within 48 hours from the date of receipt of this notice, forthwith remove the impugned article from Yashbharat.com and from every digital location under your control, or, in the alternative, publish a legally and factually accurate correction which expressly and unambiguously rectifies the false impression created by the original publication.



10.2. You are further called upon to remove, to the extent within your possession, control or ability, all social-media posts, links, reposts, promotional material, thumbnails, snippets and other digital content reproducing the impugned defamatory assertions, and to take reasonable steps to prevent their continued dissemination from accounts or channels operated or controlled by you.

10.3. You are further called upon to publish, with prominence substantially equivalent to that accorded to the original publication, an unconditional apology addressed to Shri Mahendra Goyenka and a clear correction informing readers that the earlier report had incorrectly and/or misleadingly represented the effect of the order dated 07.08.2026.

10.4. The correction shall, at a minimum, expressly state the following: "The order dated 07.08.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 26908/2025 did not record any judicial finding that Shri Mahendra Goyenka had committed fraud or conspiracy. The earlier publication incorrectly and/or misleadingly represented the effect of the said judicial order."

10.5. The aforesaid correction and apology shall remain prominently displayed for a reasonable period and shall not be buried, obscured or presented in a manner calculated to neutralise its corrective effect. You shall also refrain from any further publication or republication of unverified, misleading or defamatory statements concerning my Client.

10.6. You are further called upon to pay to my Client, within the aforesaid period, the sum of ₹5,00,00,000/- (Rupees Five Crores only) towards damages/compensation, failing which my Client shall be entitled to seek appropriate monetary relief before the competent forum, together with interest, costs and such further damages as may be proved.

11. PRESERVATION OF ELECTRONIC AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE



11.1. You are hereby placed under express notice to preserve, without alteration, deletion, suppression, destruction, overwrite or other interference, all electronic and documentary material relating directly or indirectly to the impugned publication, its preparation, approval, publication, editing, modification, dissemination and republication.

11.2. Such preservation shall include, without limitation, the original article and all HTML/webpage versions; every draft and prior version of the article; editorial notes, comments and approvals; source material and documents relied upon; photographs and videos; WhatsApp, e-mail and other communications; publication and editing logs; server and access logs; IP/access records to the extent lawfully retained; CMS records and edit history; social-media publication records; communications between reporters, correspondents, editors and management; and all other material relied upon or generated in connection with the impugned publication.

11.3. Any intentional destruction, alteration, suppression, concealment or overwriting of relevant material after receipt of this notice may be brought to the notice of the competent forum and may be relied upon in accordance with law for such orders and adverse consequences as may be legally permissible.

12. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO COMPLY

12.1. In the event you fail to comply fully and satisfactorily with the requirements contained herein within 48 hours of receipt of this notice, my Client shall, without any further reference to you, be at liberty to institute and/or pursue all proceedings and remedies that may be legally maintainable in the facts and circumstances of the case.

12.2. Such remedies may include, inter alia, a civil action for damages and compensation for defamation and reputational injury; appropriate criminal proceedings/remedies under Section 356 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, subject to fulfilment of the



statutory requirements; appropriate proceedings invoking the contempt jurisdiction of the competent constitutional Court wherever legally maintainable; proceedings for interim and permanent injunctions restraining further publication or republication; proceedings seeking removal, correction and appropriate clarification; applications for preservation, production and disclosure of electronic evidence; and proceedings for recovery of litigation expenses, costs, interest and other reliefs available in law.

12.3. The responsibility for the consequences of any continued publication, republication, circulation or further dissemination of the impugned material after receipt of this notice shall rest entirely upon the persons responsible for such continued conduct, subject to determination by the competent forum in accordance with law.

13. FINAL INTIMATION AND RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

13.1. This notice is issued without prejudice to, and with full reservation of, each and every right, remedy, claim and proceeding available to my Client in law and in equity. Nothing contained herein shall be construed as a waiver, abandonment or relinquishment of any civil, criminal, constitutional or statutory right or remedy.

13.2. Any subsequent republication, reposting, circulation, reproduction or materially similar publication made after receipt of this notice shall be considered independently for the purpose of determining further injury, liability and appropriate relief, in addition to the consequences arising from the original publication.

13.3. You are, therefore, called upon to treat this notice with the seriousness warranted by the nature of the allegations and the legal consequences flowing therefrom, and to communicate your compliance, together with proof of removal, correction, apology and payment, within 48 hours of receipt.

13.4. In the absence of complete and satisfactory compliance within the stipulated period, my Client shall proceed in accordance with law without being required to issue

आर्यन उर्मलिया

अधिवक्ता

मध्यप्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय, जबलपुर



सम्पर्क : 7898799317

ईमेल : Aryanmphcba4970@gmail.com

कार्यालय पता : 308, अप्पिट अपार्टमेंट्स, नागरध्व मोह,
सिविल लाइन्स, जबलपुर, M.P., 482001

any further notice, and all costs and consequences arising therefrom shall be to your account.

Yours faithfully,

 **Aryan Urmaliya**
Advocate, MP High Court
M-7898799317

Advocate

High Court of Madhya Pradesh

Jabalpur, M.P.

Mobile No. 7898799317

Enclosures:

Annexure A: Copy of the order dated 07.08.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 26908/2025.

Annexure B: PDF/printout and screenshots of the impugned Yashbharat.com publication dated 08.08.2026.

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 26908/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 11-08-2025 in FA No. 1550/2024 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh Principal Seat at Jabalpur]

EURO PRATIK ISPAT (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

GEOMIN INDUSTRIES PRIVATE LIMITED & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 189456/2026 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

IA No. 322823/2025 - CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION

IA No. 236429/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 189457/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 236430/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 236894/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 236428/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES

Date : 07-08-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PAMIDIGHANTAM SRI NARASIMHA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK ARADHE

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Diwakar Maheshwari, Adv.
Mr. Edupuganti Shreyas, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.(NP)
Mr. Balbir Singh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddhartha Shukla, Adv.
Ms. Shamila Iram Fatima, Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Rohatgi, Adv.
Mr. Vishal Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Tanishk Kashyap, Adv.
Mr. Vedant Kohli, Adv.
Mr. Amit Sharma, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
KAPIL TANKA
Date: 2026.08.07
17:34:11 IST
Reason: I

The present Special Leave Petition arises out of the judgment

and order dated 11.08.2025 passed by the High Court in FA No. 1550

of 2024 whereby the High Court after hearing the learned counsel for the respondent(s) remanded the matter to the Trial Court for consideration of application under Order 39 Rules 1 & 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 and pending disposal of such application made an interim arrangement to the following effect:

"43. Further. till the disposal, by the Commercial Court, of the application under Order 39 Rules 1 & 2 Code of Civil Procedure, filed by the Appellants along with the Suit, Respondent is restrained from transporting and selling the 170,000 MT of iron ore, subject matter of the agreement dated 03.04.2023. In case any part of the agreed upon stock had been removed prior to the passing of the interim order dated 07.11.2024, Respondent are restrained from transporting and selling the deficit quantity of iron ore from its other stock, if available and subject to the same being of the prescribed specification, failing which the default clauses in the agreement dated 03.04.2023 shall be applicable. "

2. This Court by order dated 19.09.2025 by taking into account the nature of controversy sought to bring about the settlement between the parties and referred the matter for mediation by appointing a mediator. It appears from record that the parties had failed to reach any settlement.

3. Having considered the matter in detail, we are of the opinion that the interest of justice would be subserved if we direct the Trial Court to take up and dispose of the application filed under Order 39 Rules 1 & 2 of the CPC within a period of two months from today.

4. Pending disposal of the application under Order 39 Rules 1 & 2 of the CPC, the interim directions granted by the High Court shall continue. It is made clear that we have not expressed any opinion

on the merits of the matter. the Commercial Court will take up and dispose of the application on its own merits.

5. All rights and contentions are left open for the parties to raise and contest before the Commercial Court.

6. With these observations, the Special Leave Petition stands disposed of.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(KAPIL TANDON)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(NIDHI WASON)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

धोखाधड़ी के आरोपी महेन्द्र गोयंका को 1.70 लाख मैट्रिक टन आयरन ओर विवाद में सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने भी नहीं दी कोई रियायत, महेन्द्र गोयनका ने पिछले तीन सालों में हर स्तर पर की धोखाधड़ी और रची साजिश



Usha Panigani

2 days ago

Last Updated: 08/09/2026

कार्पोरेट और वित्तीय अपराध



- धोखाधड़ी के आरोपी महेन्द्र गोयंका को 1.70 लाख मैट्रिक टन आयरन ओर विवाद में सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने भी नहीं दी कोई रियायत
- महेन्द्र गोयनका ने पिछले तीन सालों में हर स्तर पर की धोखाधड़ी और रची साजिश

कटनी। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने जिओमिन इंडस्ट्रीज प्राइवेट लिमिटेड और यूरो प्रतीक के बीच चल रहे विवाद को लेकर बड़ा फैसला देते हुए महेन्द्र गोयनका का केस किया डिसमिस,, कोर्ट ने कहा है कि जब तक कर्मशियल कोर्ट इस आवेदन पर अंतिम निर्णय नहीं लेती है तब तक मध्य प्रदेश हाईकोर्ट द्वारा लगाया गया अंतरिम प्रतिबंध जारी रहेगा। **कैल्क्युलेटर और संदर्भ डिवाइस**

Related Articles



Jabalpur Kanwar Yatra: जबलपुर में गूंजा 'बोल बम'; सीएम डॉ. मोहन यादव ने उठाई कांवड़, बजाया डमरू, बोले- 'सनातन के लिए काम कर रही सरकार'

13 minutes ago



स्वतंत्रता दिवस से पहले रेलवे का बड़ा फैसला, दिल्ली के लिए चार दिन पार्सल सेवा बंद

16 minutes ago

मध्यस्थता रही विफल

बलवीर सिंह एवं अधिवक्ता शर्मिला इराम फातिमा द्वारा की गई बहस के बाद दिया। कोर्ट ने कमर्शियल कोर्ट को सीपीसी के आदेश 39 के नियम एक और दो के तहत लंबित आवेदन पर दो माह के भीतर फैसला सुनाने का आदेश दिया। सुप्रीम कोर्ट द्वारा 7 अगस्त के अपने आदेश के बाद जबलपुर की कमर्शियल कोर्ट को 2 माह में जियोमिन इंडस्ट्रीज द्वारा यूरो प्रतीक इस्पात इंडिया से 1 लाख 70 हजार टन आयरन ओर खरीदी (परचेज़ एग्रीमेंट) के बाद की गई धोखाधड़ी जिसमें खरीदी अनुबंध के बाद आयरन ओर न सप्लाई करने और अनुबंध का पालन न करने पर कोर्ट में दायर वाद पर फैसला करने के आदेश दिए गए हैं।



जानकारी के अनुसार मेसर्स जियोमिन इंडस्ट्रीज प्राइवेट लिमिटेड ने जबलपुर के डिस्ट्रिक्ट जज कमर्शियल कोर्ट में मेसर्स यूरो प्रतीक इस्पात इंडिया प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कंपनी से 1 लाख 70 हजार टन आयरन ओर सेल और परचेज़ एग्रीमेंट करने के आधार पर खरीदा गया आयरन ओर प्राप्त करने के लिए कमर्शियल सूट फाइल किया है वर्तमान में यूरो प्रतीक इस्पात इंडिया का प्राइमरी शेयर होल्डर रायपुर निवासी महेंद्र गोयनका बना हुआ है।

यहां यह जानना जरूरी है कि यूरो प्रतीक इस्पात इंडिया प्राइवेट लिमिटेड को लेकर कई मामले पिछले दिनों और सालों में सुर्खियों में रहे हैं जिसमें महेंद्र गोयनका के सहयोगी 3 डायरेक्टर्स हिमांशु श्रीवास्तव, सन्मति जैन और सुनील अग्रवाल एवं अन्य सहयोगी के विरुद्ध भी कटनी के कोतवाली और माधवनगर थाने में दो अलग-अलग प्रकरण 420/120B/467/468/471 की प्राथमिकी दर्ज हैं और गोयंका के तीनों डायरेक्टर की अग्रिम जमानत मान° सुप्रीम कोर्ट से भी खारिज होने के बाद भी पिछले दो साल से तीनों डायरेक्टर फरार हैं जिन्हें कटनी पुलिस आज तक गिरफ्तार नहीं कर पायी है। जाली दस्तावेजों और फर्जी हस्ताक्षरों के जरिए यूरो प्रतीक इस्पात इंडिया प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, यूरो पैलेट कंपनी समेत कई कंपनियों पर अवैध नियंत्रण हासिल करने को लेकर मामला है।

इसी तरह कोलकत्ता में भी महेंद्र गोयनका पर हजारों करोड़ रुपये के कथित वित्तीय अनियमितताओं और कंपनी के बिके हुए माल को छल-कपट करके बेचने से जुड़े मामले सहित फर्जी तरीके से कंपनी के शेयर अपने और परिवार के नाम करवाने को लेकर भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 420, 120बी 467/468/471 सहित अन्य धाराओं के तहत प्राथमिकी दर्ज की गई थी इस मामले में कोलकत्ता पुलिस ने ने जुलाई में दो वर्षों से फरार चल रहे रायपुर निवासी महेंद्र गोयनका को गिरफ्तार करते हुए दो बार 14 दिनों तक रिमांड में लेते हुए मामले में गहन जांच की है।

विदित हो कि पिछले साल ज्योमिन कंपनी को बिके हुए इसी आयरन ओर को महेंद्र गोयनका ने जबलपुर के एक पुलिस अधिकारी और एक प्रशासनिक अधिकारी की मदद से किसी तीसरी कंपनी को बेच दिया था तभी से जियोमिन कंपनी ने गोयनका के ऊपर केस कर रखा था जिसमे आज निर्णय आया है।



Follow Us

Google News



INLAND SPEED POST DOCUMENT



EI903581896IN

Duty Office & Pincode: Katni H.O (433501)	
Booking Office: Jabalpur-RMS L1U (432001)	
Counter No. 1, 10-08-2026 17:40:31	
GST No. BkgRefID: 23S3001110022616905	
Charged Weight(gms): 46 Phy.Wt(gms): 46 Vol.Wt(gms): NA/LIN: 15	
Amount Paid: 55.00 (Base Tariff-Rs. 47 Tax-Rs. 8) (CGST-4.00)	
Mode of Payment: ONLINE Payment TransactionID	
Sender	Receiver
OFFICE OF ARYAN URMALIYA Mobile No. 7898799317 CIVIL LINES JABALPUR JABALPUR MADHYA PRADESH-482001	SANJAY SATYENDRA PATHAK Mobile No. 1234567893 KATNI KATNI MADHYA PRADESH-483501

Track on www.indiapost.gov.in OR Dial 1800 2668888 IVR NO. 5979903187
In case of any complaint, please visit <https://crm.indiapost.gov.in/track>
Go Green!!! Opt for eReceipts, ePCD
This is system generated document, no manual signature required
10-08-2026 17:40:37

From,
Office of Aryan Urmaliya
Advocate, M.P. High Court Jabalpur
Office Address: 308, Arpit Apartments, Nagrath
Chowk, Civil Lines, Jabalpur, MP, 482001
Mobile No. 7898799317

To,
Shri Sanjay Satyendra Pathak, MLA
Owner / The Editor / Editor-in-Chief / Publisher
Yashbharat.com News Portal
Address: Office of Yashbharat.com News Portal
Kachahri Chowk, Opposite MGM Hospital
District Katni, Madhya Pradesh - 483501