

237

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-49167-2021

Decided on: 7th February, 2022

Devinder Sandhu

Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Ajaivir Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

[1] Due to COVID-19 situation, the Court is convened through video conference.

[2] This petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is filed seeking quashing of order dated 11th November, 2021 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Special Court, SAS Nagar, Mohali declining the permission sought by the petitioner to go abroad.

[3] The petitioner was granted regular bail in F.I.R. No. 11, dated 17th September, 2020 under Sections 409, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC and Sections 7(a), 7(b), 7(c), 7-A, Section 13(1) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 as

amended by the Act of 2018, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, F.S-1, S.A.S. Nagar.

[4] Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is Senior Director of M/s WWICS Global Law Offices Pvt. Ltd. having Head Office at SAS Nagar and Branch Offices at U.A.E. And Canada. It is submitted that petitioner is on bail and his fundamental right guaranteed under Article 19 of the Constitution of India is being violated by denying his permission to go abroad in connection with his business. He further submits that conduct of the petitioner is evident from the fact that in the bail proceedings, the investigating agency had stated that petitioner joined in the investigation, cooperated and his custody is not required. Contention is that proceedings of the present FIR were stayed by the High Court in CRM-M-45242 of 2018 titled as *Sumedh Singh Saini v. State of Punjab*.

[5] Learned State counsel submits that seminar which the petitioner had to attend in January, 2022 is over, as on date the petitioner has no confirmed programme for going abroad.

[6] Learned senior counsel for the petitioner refutes the contentions of learned State counsel and submits that petitioner was granted permission to go abroad in proceedings of another FIR. The petitioner is ready to comply with any reasonable condition imposed for his travelling abroad.

[7] Without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Sessions

Court concerned with fresh application for seeking permission to go abroad annexing the tentative tour programme.

[8] There is no doubt that the application would be decided expeditiously, on the merits in accordance with law considering the nature of business, without being influenced by the impugned order in the present petition.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

7th February, 2022

pankaj baweja

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes /No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes /No |