



\$~68

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7333/2025 & CRL.M.A. 30771/2025**

DIRECTORATE OF REVENUE INTELLIGENCEPetitioner

Through: Mr. Satish Agarwala, Senior Standing
Counsel and Mr. Gagan Vaswani,
Advocates.

versus

KINGSLEY CHIZOBA URAMARespondent

Through: Mr. Anup Kumar Das and Mr. Uday
Chauhan, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
15.10.2025

%

1. The present petition under Section 528 read with Section 483 (3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ [formerly Sections 482 and Section 439(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure²] seeks cancellation of bail granted to the Respondent *vide* order dated 10th December, 2024, in *BAIL APPLICATION NO. 4018/2024*, titled *Kingsley Chizoba Urama v Directorate of Revenue Intelligence*.

2. Counsel for the Petitioner argues that the Respondent has violated conditions no. 3 and 4 of the bail, inasmuch as he has failed to furnish his contact mobile number to the Investigating Officer and has also not

¹ "BNSS"

² "Cr.P.C."



intimated any change in his residential address or contact details. He submits that upon verification, when the IO visited the address furnished by the Respondent in his bail application, the Respondent was not found residing there, and neither the caretaker nor the neighbours confirmed his presence at the said address.

3. In response, counsel for the Respondent submits that upon being released from custody, the Respondent had furnished his contact details to Mr. Manoj, who was the IO at that time. He states that subsequent to the said communication, there appears to have been a change in the IO, of which the Respondent was not informed. The contact details, however, have been filed before the Trial Court. It is further submitted that the Respondent has been regularly appearing before the Trial Court without any default. As regards the change of address, it is explained that in the bail application, the address mentioned corresponded to the one recorded in the FIR. However, in the bail bond executed thereafter, the Respondent disclosed his updated residential address and there has been no change in address since then. The same has also been duly filed on record before the Trial Court, by a compliance affidavit in terms of the order dated 10th December, 2024.

4. Counsel for the Applicant submits that the said compliance is belated and was made only after service of the present petition upon Respondent No. 2.

5. Be that as it may, in the opinion of the Court, in light of the explanation rendered by the Respondent, no case is made out for cancellation of bail.

6. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed along with pending application.

7. The Respondent shall continue to remain bound by the terms and



conditions imposed in the order granting bail.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

OCTOBER 15, 2025/MK