

## Your Trusted Management Advisory

www.transglobeadvisors.in

### Order Order

## Madhya Pradesh HC dismisses plea by Shah Bano Begum's daughter



The Indore Bench of Madhya Pradesh High Court (HC) has dismissed a petition to restrain the release of the film 'Haq' which draws inspiration from the Shah Bano case in which the Supreme Court ruled in favour of giving maintenance to divorced Muslim women. The petition against the movie was filed by Shah Bano Begum's daughter, Siddiqua Begum Khan, contending that the film distorted personal events that took place in Shah Bano's life. The Enamul Hashmi, Yami Gautam starrer film is set to release on November 7.

Siddiqua said that the movie commercially exploits the privacy and personality of her deceased mother without taking consent from her legal heirs. She added that she had inherited her late mother's reputational rights after Bano's death. Justice Pranay Verma has rejected these arguments, holding "privacy or reputation earned by a person during his or her lifetime extinguishes with his or her death. It cannot be inherited like a movable or immovable property." The Court further accepted the filmmaker's stance that the film is only inspired by the Supreme Court case but is otherwise fictional and that a disclaimer about this is also part of the movie.

"Since the disclaimer itself states that the same is dramatisation and is fictional and an adaptation of a book and is inspired by a judgment of the Supreme Court, it cannot be said that the contents of the film are fabricated. Since the film is an inspiration and a fiction, some amount of leeway is certainly permissible and merely because the same is done, it cannot be said that there has been any sensationalisation or false portrayal," the Court said, adding that the film is stated to be largely inspired from publicly available court records.

## Accused must be given grounds of arrest in writing: SC reiterates

**PIONEER NEWS SERVICE**  
■ New Delhi

Retracting its earlier orders, the Supreme Court (SC) on Thursday held that police and investigating agencies must provide written grounds of arrest to every arrested person as soon as possible, regardless of the offence or statute under which the arrest is made. A Bench of Chief Justice of India BR Gavai and Justice AG Masih said the right to be informed of the grounds of arrest is a fundamental and mandatory safeguard under Article 22(1) of the Constitution and applies to all offences.

In certain exceptional situations when it is not possible to supply written grounds immediately, the ground should be conveyed orally to the accused. Even in such cases, written grounds must be furnished to the accused within a reasonable time and no later than two hours before the accused is produced before the Magistrate for remand proceedings, the Court ordered. The judgment came in a batch of appeals arising from the 2024 World BMW crash case in Mumbai.

"The constitutional mandate of informing the arrestee the grounds of arrest is mandatory in all offences under all statutes including offences under IPC 1860 (now BNS 2023)," said the Supreme Court, citing various orders passed earlier. The Court described this right as an integral part of personal liberty under Article 21, emphasising that an arrest made without following this safeguard is unconstitutional. "If a person is not informed of the grounds of his arrest as soon as may be, it would amount to the violation of his fundamental rights thereby curtailing his right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, rendering the arrest illegal,"



the judgement said, adding that every arrested person must receive the grounds of arrest in writing, and the document must be in a language that the person understands.

"The grounds of arrest must be provided to the arrestee in a language which he/she understands," the Bench said. The judges added that merely reading out the reasons for arrest does not fulfil the constitutional requirement.

"The objective of the constitutional mandate would not be fulfilled by mere reading out the grounds to the arrested person, such an approach would be antithetical to the purpose of Article 22(1)," the judgement said. The Court noted that written communication is important not only to protect the rights of the arrested person but also to help investigating agencies prove that proper procedure was followed if challenged later.

At the same time, the Bench recognised that in certain exceptional circumstances, it may not be immediately possible to hand over a written document — for

instance, when a crime is committed in front of a police officer and immediate arrest is required. "In exceptional circumstances such as offences against body or property committed in flagrant delicto, where informing the grounds of arrest in writing on arrest is rendered impractical, it shall be sufficient for the police officer or other person making the arrest to orally convey the same," the Court said. Even in such cases, the Court said the written grounds must be supplied within a reasonable time and no later than two hours before the accused is produced before the magistrate for remand proceedings. "The two-hour threshold before production for remand strikes a judicious balance between safeguarding the arrestee's constitutional rights under Article 22(1) and preserving the operational continuity of criminal investigations," the Bench observed. The Court directed its registry to circulate copies of the judgment to all Registrars General of High Courts and Chief Secretaries of States and Union Territories to ensure uniform implementation. The appellants were represented by Senior Advocates Abhishek Manu Singhvi and Vikram Chaudhri.

**PIONEER NEWS SERVICE**  
■ New Delhi

The Supreme Court (SC) on Thursday expressed strong displeasure over the Centre's request to adjourn the hearing on a batch of pleas including the one filed by the Madras Bar Association, challenging the constitutional validity of the 2021 law on tribunal reforms. On November 3, a bench headed by Chief Justice BR Gavai took strong note of the Centre's application seeking a direction to refer to a five-judge bench the pleas challenging the provisions of the Tribunals Reforms (Rationalisation and Conditions of Service) Act, 2021, saying that it did not expect this from the Government at the fag end of the financial year.

The 2021 Act abolishes certain Appellate Tribunals, including the Film Certification Appellate Tribunal and amends various



CJI BR Gavai

terms related to the appointment and tenure of judicial and other members of various Tribunals.

The CJI-led bench had then threatened dismissal of the Centre's plea, moved through Attorney General R

Venkataramani to get the matters referred to a larger bench, saying it did not approve such tactics from the Union Government.

This led the AG to argue the case on merits on Monday and after that the bench fixed

the hearing on Friday.

On Thursday, Additional Solicitor General Aishwarya Bhatti mentioned the matter and sought an adjournment on behalf of the attorney general, citing the latter's international arbitration

commitments. "Very unfair to the court," the CJI said. The AG said that the Attorney General has an international arbitration scheduled on Friday and hence sought an accommodation. "We have accommodated him for so much time. We have accommodated him twice. This is not fair to the court," the CJI again said.

"If you want to keep it after 24 (November), you tell us frankly," the CJI, who is retiring on November 23, told Bhatti. When ASG Bhatti suggested the matter be taken up on Monday, the visibly irked Chief Justice remarked, "When do we write the judgment then? Every day we are told he's busy with arbitration. At the last moment, you come with an application to refer the matter to a Constitution Bench".

The CJI also questioned why another law officer could not represent the Union in

the matter. "You have a battery of competent ASGs. When we were in the High Court, we gave up other briefs for part-heard matters," he said, adding that the bench had kept its Friday schedule clear to conclude hearings and use the weekend to prepare the judgment. Ultimately, the bench agreed to hear senior advocate Arvind Datar, representing the petitioner Madras Bar Association, on Friday and accommodate the Attorney General's submissions on Monday. "If he does not come, we will close the matter," the CJI said.

Earlier, the bench, which also comprised Justice K Viond Chandran, has already heard final arguments on behalf of petitioners, including lead petitioner the Madras Bar Association, in the matter. Previous hearing, the CJI observed that it seems the Centre wanted to avoid the present bench.

## No plans to install cameras in Ajmer dargah's sanctum sanctorum

**PIONEER NEWS SERVICE**  
■ New Delhi

The Delhi High Court (HC) was informed by the Centre on Thursday that it has no plans to install CCTV cameras inside the sanctum sanctorum of the dargah of Sufi saint Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti in Ajmer.

The Centre said CCTV cameras will be restricted to public approach areas and passages leading up to the sanctum and that cameras are being installed to prevent instances of pickpocketing, harassment and theft.

Justice Sachin Datta noted the submissions of the Centre's counsel on the aspect of cameras and directed the Government to expedite the process of appointment of the members of the Ajmer Sharif Dargah Committee.

"Let the process be expedited and members be appointed as expeditiously as possible, preferably within 3 months," the court said.

The court passed the order while disposing of a plea by Syed Mehraj Miya, a khatid of the dargah, challenging the decision of Centre-appointed Nazim to install cameras within the sanctum.

The dargah committee is tasked with managing the affairs of the 13-century shrine but has been lying defunct since 2022. In the absence of the committee, decisions related to the dargah are taken by the central Government-appointed Nazim and assistant Nazim.

As the Centre's counsel clarified that the move followed a security audit and



Ajmer Sharif Dargah

cameras were not being installed inside the sanctum, the petitioner's counsel said there was no objection to cameras being placed in public approach areas, leading the court to dispose of the plea.

Khatids are hereditary custodians of the Ajmer Sharif dargah and are responsible for its management, rituals and upkeep of the Sufi shrine.

Besides the aspect of cameras, the petitioner also sought court's direction to the Centre to appoint the dargah management committee. He claimed that there were several alleged finan-

cial irregularities in the functioning of the office bearers at the dargah at present and said that it was damaging the religious site's image.

"The said anomalies in the finances of the dargah committee are extremely alarming and would be adversely affecting the trust and confidence of devotees/pilgrims of Sufi Saint Khwaja Sahib from across the world irrespective of faith, religion, caste, creed, ethnicity, colour or race who generously donate and deposit monetary funds either online or during their regular visit to the Dargah Ajmer Sharif," the plea said.



### Embassy Developments Limited

(Formerly Equinox India Developments Limited and earlier Indiabulls Real Estate Limited)

#### Statement of Unaudited Consolidated Financial Results for the quarter and half year ended 30 September 2025

Sl. No.	Particulars	3 months ended	Preceding 3 months ended	Corresponding 3 months ended	Year to date figures for current period ended	Year to date figures for previous period ended	Previous year ended
		30 Sept. 2025	30 June 2025	30 Sept. 2024	30 Sept. 2025	30 Sept. 2024	31 March 2025
		(Unaudited)	(Unaudited)	(Unaudited)	(Unaudited)	(Unaudited)	(Audited)
1	Total Income from operations	4,931.09	6,809.19	4,754.72	11,740.28	9,653.29	21,769.25
2	Net Profit / (Loss) for the year/period (before Tax, Minority Interest and Exceptional and/or Extraordinary Items)	(1,524.86)	(1,647.58)	(274.55)	(3,172.44)	(1,004.61)	553.19
3	Net (Loss) / Profit for the year/period before Tax and Minority Interest (after Exceptional and/or Extraordinary Items)	(1,519.86)	(1,647.58)	(274.55)	(3,167.44)	(1,004.61)	273.19
4	Net (Loss) / Profit for the year/period after Tax and Minority Interest (after Exceptional and/or Extraordinary Items)	(1,524.89)	(1,656.00)	(288.58)	(3,180.69)	963.75	2,029.32
5	Total Comprehensive Income for the year/period (Comprising Profit / (Loss) for the year/period (after tax) and Other Comprehensive Income (after tax)	(1,508.86)	(1,656.43)	(1,463.81)	(3,165.29)	1,587.45	2,111.69
6	Earnings per Share (face value of ₹ 2/- each)						
	- Basic (Amount in ₹)	(1.12)	(1.29)	(0.54)	(2.40)	1.45	2.76
	- Diluted (Amount in ₹)	(1.12)	(1.29)	(0.54)	(2.40)	1.37	2.65
7	Paid up Equity Share Capital	2,741.26	2,730.50	1,271.74	2,741.26	1,271.74	2,443.88
8	Other equity						93,266.51

#### Statement of Unaudited Standalone Financial Results :

1. The above consolidated results have been reviewed by the Audit Committee and subsequently approved at the meeting of the Board of Directors held on 06 November 2025. These financial results have been subjected to limited review by the statutory auditors of the Company.

### Embassy Developments Limited

(Formerly Equinox India Developments Limited and earlier Indiabulls Real Estate Limited)

#### Statement of Unaudited Standalone Financial Results for the quarter and half year ended 30 September 2025

Sl. No.	Particulars	3 months ended	Preceding 3 months ended	Corresponding 3 months ended	Year to date figures for current period ended	Year to date figures for previous period ended	Previous year ended
		30 Sept. 2025	30 June 2025	30 Sept. 2024	30 Sept. 2025	30 Sept. 2024	31 March 2025
		(Unaudited)	(Unaudited)	(Unaudited)	(Unaudited)	(Unaudited)	(Audited)
1	Total Income from Operations	1,662.45	1,188.45	4,060.92	2,850.90	12,289.56	21,123.57
2	Net (Loss) / Profit for the year/period (before Tax, Exceptional and/or Extraordinary Items)	(420.56)	(903.69)	(144.39)	(1,324.25)	980.91	803.14
3	Net (Loss) / Profit for the year/period before Tax (after Exceptional and/or Extraordinary Items)	(415.56)	(903.69)	(144.39)	(1,319.25)	980.91	823.14
4	Net (Loss) / Profit for the year/period after Tax (after Exceptional and/or Extraordinary Items)	(404.79)	(888.04)	(141.72)	(1,292.83)	3,085.71	2,641.78
5	Total Comprehensive Income for the year/period (Comprising Profit / (Loss) for the period (after tax) and Other Comprehensive Income (after tax)	(386.77)	(888.04)	(141.72)	(1,274.81)	3,085.71	977.05
6	Earnings per Share (of ₹ 2/- each)						
	- Basic (Amount in ₹)	(0.30)	(0.69)	(0.22)	(0.97)	5.06	3.66
	- Diluted (Amount in ₹)	(0.30)	(0.69)	(0.22)	(0.97)	4.90	3.51
7	Paid-up equity share capital (face value of ₹ 2 per equity share)	2,741.26	2,730.50	1,271.70	2,741.26	1,271.70	2,443.88
8	Other equity						99,265.92

#### Notes to the standalone financial results:

- The above results have been reviewed by the Audit Committee and subsequently approved at the meeting of the Board of Directors held on 06 November 2024. These financial results have been subjected to limited review by the statutory auditors of the Company.
- The above is an extract of the detailed format of Quarterly / Annual Financial Results filed with the Stock Exchanges under Regulation 33 of the SEBI (Listing and Other Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. The full format of the Quarterly / Annual Financial Results are available on the Company's website (<https://embassyindia.com>) and on the website of BSE (<https://www.bseindia.com>) and NSE (<https://www.nseindia.com>).

Registered Office: Office No. 01-1001, WeWork, Blue One Square,  
Udyog Vihar Phase 4 Rd, Gurgaon, Haryana 122016  
Corporate Identity Number (CIN): L45101HR2006PLC095409



For and on behalf of the Board of Directors

Aditya Virmani  
Managing Director

Place : Mumbai  
Date : 06 November 2025