

CHART DISCLOSING PARTICULARS OF PAYMENT OF ENTIRE PRINCIPAL AMOUNTS RELEASED TO BANKS ON AN ADHOC BASIS BY HON'BLE SPECIAL COURT AND HON'BLE SUPREME COURT AGAINST EX-PARTE DECREES WHICH ARE STILL UNDER CHALLENGE BEFORE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT

Sr. No.	Name of the Bank	Particulars	Date of Order	Decree Amount (In Crs.)	Amount paid (In Crs.)	Order Date
1	Standard Chartered Bank	Suit No. 28 of 95 SCB Vs. HSM	25.07.2003	506.54	506.54	08.09.2017
2	State Bank of India	Suit No. 41 of 95 SCB Vs. HSM	03.03.2003	137.12	86.99	25.02.2011
					50.13	03.03.2003
		M.P. No. 63 of 1992 SBI, NHB Vs HSM	22.04.2003	706.97	706.97	Feb., March 2003, 25.02.2011 & 09.09.2011
		M.P. No. 14 of 1995 SBI Vs HSM	14.08.2003	222.04	130.73	Feb., March 2003
				91.31	08.09.2017	
3	State Bank of Saurashtra (since merged with State Bank of India)	Suit No. 52 of 1993 S B of Sau. Vs. HSM	18.01.1999	99.11	99.11	25.02.2011
		Suit No. 44 of 1995 S B of Sau. Vs. HSM	23.09.2003	0.14	0.14	25.02.2011
4	SBI Capital Markets Ltd.	M.P. No. 61 of 1992 SBI Capital Mkt. Vs HSM	25.06.2003	16.25	16.25	12.01.2018
5*	Canfina	Report of 11 of 2018 Canfina Vs ASM	12.04.2018	25.00	25.00	12.04.2018
6*	Canfina	M P 22 OF 1992 CANFINA VS ASM	2007	2.90	2.90	
	GRAND TOTAL			1716.07	1716.07	

- 1* . These are Decrees against M/s. Ashwin Mehta for transactions in Capital market.
2. Smt. Jyoti Mehta discovered around 2008 after taking inspection of records that ex-parte decrees have been obtained by SBI, SBI Capital Markets, Standard Chartered Bank by playing a fraud on Hon'ble Special Court and by acting in collusion with the Custodian and therefore she has challenged these decrees.
3. In terms of his statutory duties as also as per settled law, the Custodian had a duty to contest the false claims of the banks on HSM but instead he supported them by acting in collusion with them on several counts.
4. As per settled law, no interest was leviable on HSM by banks post his notification on 08.06.1992 but Custodian did not oppose levy of interest on HSM @ 15% to 18% p.a. so that he becomes bankrupt. Besides above, huge losses of Rs.20,677.28 Crores have been suffered by Mehtas by premature sale of their investments in blue-chips to release monies to IT department and banks even before the claims are crystallized and became final and binding on Mehtas.
5. Complete demands of tax of Rs.3285.46 Crores and entire principal sum of Rs.1716.07 Crores have been paid to the banks overruling the objections in complete violation of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Harshad Shantilal Mehta Vs Custodian reported as (1998) 5 SCC 1.