



\$~80 & 81

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ BAIL APPLN. 2245/2026

JAWAD AHMAD SIDDIQUI

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Vikram Chaudhari, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Vishvendra Tomar, Mr.
Talib Mustafa, Mr. Abhishek Singh
and Mr. Shubh Mathur, Advs.

Versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Panel Counsel
with Mr. Pranjal Tripathi, Mr.
Kanishk Maurya, Mr. Siddharth
Bajaj and Mr. Yash Jangid, Advs.
for ED

81

+ BAIL APPLN. 2246/2026

JAWAD AHMAD SIDDIQUI

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Vikram Chaudhari, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Vishvendra Tomar, Mr.
Talib Mustafa, Mr. Abhishek Singh
and Mr. Shubh Mathur, Advs.

Versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Panel Counsel
with Mr. Pranjal Tripathi, Mr.
Kanishk Maurya, Mr. Siddharth
Bajaj and Mr. Yash Jangid, Advs.
for ED



CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

13.07.2026

1. By virtue of the present applications under *Section 483* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**), read with *Section 45* of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (**PMLA**), the applicant seeks grant of interim bail for a period of *six weeks* in Prosecution Complaint Case nos. CT/02/2026 arising out of ECIR/STF/33/2025 dated 14.11.2025 and CT/14/2026 arising out of ECIR/STF/03/2026 dated 05.01.2026 as also setting aside of two separate orders both dated 09.06.2026 passed in Bail Application nos.1543/2026 and 1544/2026 passed by learned ASJ-02, Special Judge (PMLA), Saket Courts.

2. At the outset, learned senior counsel for applicant has handed over a copy of the rejoinder stated to have already been filed, but not on record. The same has been verified by learned senior counsel for ED, and is taken on record.

3. Learned senior counsel for applicant submits that Mrs. Usma Akhtar (***applicant's wife***), aged 52 years, was first diagnosed with Ovarian Cancer in the year 2022. Thereafter, in March, 2024, the disease recurred with widespread Metastatic and she was formally diagnosed with '*Stage-IV Metastatic Ovarian Carcinoma-HRD Positive, MSI Stable*' with a CA-125 tumour marker of 900 U/ml. To buttress it, he places reliance upon the two Discharge Summary(s) dated 18.04.2026 and 08.05.2026 issued by the Department of Medical Oncology, Indraprastha Apollo Hospitals, New Delhi under the care of Dr. P. K. Das, MD, DM (Medical Oncology).

4. Learned senior counsel further submits that the applicant's wife has



undergone three successive lines of chemotherapy, each consisting of six cycles and has now been put on ‘*maintenance chemotherapy*’ which has to be undertaken on a fortnight basis. Essentially, the learned senior counsel submits that the treatment she receives today is directed not at curing the disease but at containing it for as long as possible.

5. Learned senior counsel also submits that the applicant, being the husband, is her sole primary caregiver, and is best suited to provide her with essential physical, emotional, and psychological support and in his absence, she has had to rely on the daughter of her house help to accompany her to hospital appointments. In this regard, the learned senior counsel relies upon the certificate/ opinion dated 29.05.2026 issued under the care of the treating oncologist.

6. Learned senior counsel further submits that apart from the applicant, there is no other family member available to take care for his ailing wife, which is apparent from the record that the applicant’s parents and father-in-law are deceased, his mother-in-law is over 75 years old and suffers from multiple health conditions and his three children have been residing in the UAE since the year 2017 and 2019 i.e. well before the onset of her illness, with the eldest son remaining there to take care for his younger siblings.

7. Lastly, though learned senior counsel has cited various judgments, however, specifically relying upon ***Directorate of Enforcement vs. Manoj Gaur*** [order dated 06.02.2026 in Crl. M. (Bail) 253/2026]; ***Lovee Narula vs. Directorate of Enforcement*** [order dated 09.06.2025 in B.A. No.1937/2025]; ***Rajesh Kumar vs. Directorate of Enforcement*** [order dated 05.02.2026 in B.A. No.2928/2025]; ***Jaspreet Singh Bagga vs.***



Directorate of Enforcement [order dated 21.08.2025 in B.A. No. 2470/2025] he submits that the rigours of *Section 45* of PMLA do not operate as a jurisdictional bar to temporary reliefs such as interim bail on medical and humanitarian grounds. Even otherwise, the applicant has already been granted regular bail in two predicate offences i.e. in FIR nos.337/2025 and 338/2025 registered at PS.: Crime Branch, Delhi.

8. *Per contra*, learned senior counsel for Directorate of Enforcement (**ED**) opposes the present applications. He submits that the applicant has sought interim bail on the medical condition of his ailing wife, however, the medical reports available on record clearly reflect that the medical condition of his wife is historical in nature i.e. existing since 2022 with a surgery done in 2024 and as per the Discharge Summary(s) dated 18.04.2026 and 08.05.2026 and medical papers, she is responding/tolerating well to chemotherapy and is in a stable condition with no emergency or immediate requirement of hospitalization and is currently being treated by medication only on OPD basis.

9. Learned senior counsel for ED further submits that the medical condition of the applicant's wife is not as serious as portrayed. In any event, several adult family members, both male and female, reside just a few minutes away and are available to provide her with the necessary physical, emotional, and psychological support. He contends that, despite claiming her condition is serious, the applicant has failed to explain why his three educated and capable children continue to reside in the UAE instead of caring for their ailing mother.

10. Learned senior counsel for ED further submits that the applicant has failed to satisfy the triple test of bail as he poses to be a serious flight risk



and the Court needs to take into consideration as to whether the applicant has the means and ability to sustain himself abroad. In the present case, the fact that the applicant's children are settled in the UAE, coupled with the allegation that the proceeds of crime were siphoned off outside India, indicates that he has the resources to flee the country through illegal channels. Moreover, the aforesaid apprehension is further reinforced by his involvement in the Delhi Red Fort bomb blast case, which is presently under investigation by the NIA.

11. Lastly, though learned senior counsel for ED has cited various judgments, however, specifically relying upon ***Vijay Madanlal Choudhary vs. Union of India: 2022 SCC OnLine SC 929***; ***Directorate of Enforcement vs. Raj Singh Gehlot*** [CrI MC 3713/2022], and ***State of Maharashtra vs. Vinod Sabaji Loke, 1995 SCC OnLine Bom 388***, he submits that the validity and rationale of the mandatory twin conditions under *Section 45* of the PMLA has been upheld to find equal applicability in interim bail applications. In fact, having regard to the antecedents of the accused, including his alleged involvement as one of the accused in FIR No.229/2025 relating to the Red Fort bomb blast case, he has not been able to meet the rigours under *Section 45* of the PMLA, and is not entitled to the relief of interim bail.

12. In light of the aforesaid, learned senior counsel for ED contends that the applicant has failed to make out any exceptional, urgent or supervening circumstance warranting grant of interim bail pending disposal of the main bail application.

13. This Court has heard both learned senior counsel(s) for the applicant and the ED, as also perused the documents and materials on



record along with the judicial precedents cited at Bar.

14. Regarding the plethora of judgments cited at Bar by both learned senior counsel for the applicant as also for the ED, considering that the present are applications where the applicant is seeking grant of interim bail under the facts and circumstances as also since his wife is suffering from *Stage-IV Metastatic Ovarian Carcinoma-HRD Positive, MSI Stable*, this Court proceed to decide the present applications on their own merits *de hors* them.

15. As borne out from the medical documents on record, it is not in dispute that the applicant's wife is suffering from *Stage-IV Metastatic Ovarian Carcinoma-HRD Positive, MSI Stable* with a CA-125 tumour marker of 900 U/ml.

16. Further, a perusal of the latest PET-CT Report dated 26.05.2026 reveals that the Doctors are of the opinion that there is '*no evidence of metabolically active local recurrent disease*'; '*evidence of multiple variable sized hypodense lesions with no significantly increased metabolic activity in both the lobes of liver-resolving metastatic lesions (? From low grade malignant pathology)*'; and '*no other significant abnormal metabolically active focus in rest of the visualized body*'. In fact, when compared to the previous PET-CT report dated 06.04.2026, there is '*mild decrease (~10-20%) in size of most of the lesions with no significant change in metabolic activity*' and the '*overall scan findings are suggestive of stable disease (RECIST 1.1)*', based whereon, this Court is unable to ascertain the impending urgency or critical condition of the applicant's wife as alleged herein. In fact, it appears to be a case wherein the condition of the wife is not deteriorating and is rather improving.



17. Relevantly, it is not the applicant's case that his wife is terminally ill/ bedridden/ incapable of managing her day-to-day affairs. In fact, the applicant himself asserts that his wife travelled to the UAE in February 2026, *albeit*, allegedly on a wheelchair, without the assistance of any caregiver, which, *prima facie*, demonstrates her ability to take care of herself. That she had issues is a different issue altogether, since what is material is her status, her strength and consequently her requirement.

18. Moreover, it is also an admitted position that the applicant's wife is presently undergoing '*maintenance chemotherapy*' once every fortnight, which treatment is administered under local anaesthesia in a day-care setting, and she is discharged on the very same day. Also, the material on record indicates that the treatment is a planned and periodic regimen intended to maintain her medical condition and is not shown to involve any medical emergency or critical procedure necessitating the applicant's continuous presence.

19. Furthermore, apart from the Certificate/ opinion dated 29.05.2026 issued under the care of the treating oncologist, which too does not indicate the dire need of the applicant's presence, no material has been placed on record to establish that the applicant's presence is medically indispensable or that the support available to his wife through her family members is inadequate.

20. From all that are before this Court, there is nothing on record showing that there was ever any emergent situation or any kind of complaint(s) from the applicant's wife at any point of time since long. Further, there is nothing on record to show which ever prompted her and/ or anybody connected/ with her to seek any kind of help from any



quarters, much less, any of her relatives, who are residing within the same vicinity and a few kilometres away from where she is staying.

21. Lastly, though this Court is sympathetic towards the medical condition of the applicant's wife, however, considering the gravity and nature of the allegations levelled against the applicant, and the status of the proceedings, the role assigned to him, his status and position in the University/ Society, this Court is of the considered opinion that the statutory rigours governing grant of bail cannot be diluted merely on humanitarian considerations, more so, in the absence of any emergent and/ or exceptional circumstance warranting the applicant's immediate release. More so, he may be a flight risk and may be in a position to influence the witnesses and/ or try to tamper with evidence.

22. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is not inclined to grant interim bail to the present applicant at this stage.

23. However, in order to balance the equities as also taking a humanitarian view, this Court deems it appropriate to grant custody parole to the applicant for a period of *three days* i.e. 21.07.2026, 23.07.2026 and 25.07.2026.

24. Accordingly, the concerned Jail Superintendent is directed to make adequate security arrangements, particularly, keeping in mind the status of the present applicant, who is a high-risk undertrial, to ensure that he is in a position to meet his ailing wife at 274-A, Al-Falah House, Jamia Nagar, Okhla, New Delhi-110 025 on 21.07.2026, 23.07.2026 and 25.07.2026 between 10:00 AM to 04:00 PM.

25. During such custody parole, the applicant would only be permitted



to meet his ailing wife at the aforesaid address and be not allowed to meet and/ or interact with any other person.

26. As such, the present applications are disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

27. A copy of the present order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent for information and compliance.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

JULY 13, 2026/Ab/DA