



\$~30

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

+ CRL.M.C. 5169/2022

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Mridul Jain, Spl. PP for CBI.

versus

SHRI M. THIAGARAJAN ..... Respondent

Through: Mr.Siddharth Sunil & Mr.Aditya  
Wadhwa, Advs.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**ORDER**

% **22.04.2024**

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (in short, 'Cr.P.C.'), challenging the Order dated 09.06.2022 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Impugned Order') passed by the learned Special Judge, PC Act, CBI-04, Rouse Avenue Courts, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Revisional Court') in Crl. Revision. No. 16/2022 titled *M.Thiagarajan v. CBI*, cancelling the Look Out Circular (in short, 'LOC') dated 24.06.2016 issued against the respondent herein.

2. The learned counsel for the respondent points out that post the Impugned Order, the respondent was granted Bail by an Order dated 01.09.2022 passed by the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, New Delhi District, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Trial Court') in CBI Case No. 239/2019 titled *CBI v. M/s Paramount Airways Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.*. He further submits that the main premise of the petitioner in moving the present petition and challenging the Impugned Order, is that further investigation was pending against the respondent herein. He submits that after the passing of the impugned Order, even this



premise also no longer survives inasmuch as a supplementary chargesheet has been filed before the learned Trial Court, and there is no further investigation which is pending.

3. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that merely because the petitioner has been granted Bail, cannot be a reason to hold that present petition has been rendered infructuous. He further submits that though supplementary chargesheet has been filed, he has no instructions if there is further investigation pending against the respondent.

4. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

5. As recorded by the learned Revisional Court in its Impugned Order, the purpose of the LOC is to ensure that the accused joins investigation and surrenders before the concerned Trial Court.

6. In the present case, not only the chargesheet and the supplementary chargesheet stand filed, but the respondent has also been granted Bail by the learned Trial Court itself. It would be open to the petitioner to seek appropriate conditions in the Order of the learned Trial Court which granted Bail to the respondent, if it so warrants. However, in view the above developments, no fault/infirmity can be found in the Impugned Order passed by the learned Revisional Court.

7. The present petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**APRIL 22, 2024/rv/AS**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*