



\$~11

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7956/2025**

KUNAL CHAWLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Aman Gaur, Adv, Mr. Kumar
Balram Adv, Mr. Arkish Das Adv.

versus

DIRETORATE OF REVENUE DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Satish Aggarwala, Sr. Standing
Counsel and Mr. Gagan Vaswani,
Advocate for Respondent/DRI in Crl.
M.C. No. 7956/2025

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

04.12.2025

%

1. Petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*hereinafter referred to as 'B.N.S.S.'*) and Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (*hereinafter referred to as 'Cr.PC'*) has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner, namely, Kunal Chawla for setting-aside the Order dated 25.09.2025 of learned Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi wherein the request to reduce the Travel Security Amount from Rs.10,00,000/- to Rs.2,50,000/-, has been dismissed and some unwarranted and adverse remarks have been made against the Petitioner.
2. It is submitted on behalf of the Petitioner that he had moved an Application seeking permission to travel abroad, which was allowed *vide* Order dated 26.08.2025 by learned ACJM, on the terms of furnishing an FDR in the sum of Rs.10,00,000/-.
3. It is submitted that *vide* Order dated 25.09.2025, the Application filed



by the Petitioner for reduction of the travel security amount, was dismissed.

4. **Submissions heard.**

5. The Petitioner is at liberty to make submissions in regard to the amount of Travel Security before the learned Trial Court, in this regard.

6. **The second prayer**, which has been made is that there are certain unwarranted remarks made in the Order dated 25.09.2025. It is submitted that it has been observed by the learned Trial Court that the permission to travel abroad was granted to the Applicant on the presumption that he shall not evade the enquiry/prosecution. However, it was observed *“that it appears that the Applicant is misusing the liberty granted to him. It is also observed that the Application moved on behalf of the Applicant, has not been signed by the Applicant nor any Affidavit is attached.”*

7. It is submitted that the Petitioner had already furnished the fresh address in August, 2024 and had even joined the investigations, pursuant to the service of the Notice.

8. The record shows that the permission was for the travelling from 27.08.2025 to 31.10.2025. The Application has become infructuous. Insofar as, the reduction in amount for the future is concerned, no pre-emptive Order can be made by this Court.

9. The second prayer is in regard to the observations made in the Order dated 25.09.2025, were unwarranted.

10. In the said Order, the submissions of the learned SPP was recorded, which is as under:-

“3.Ld. SPP for the department objects to the present application on the ground that the applicant has not joined the investigation despite summons being issued. She submits that the summons issued upon the applicant have returned back unserved with the



report that the building in which the applicant has stated himself to be resided is presently under construction. It is further submitted that Ld. Counsel for the applicant has made a submission that fresh address of the applicant would be supplied to the department but no such fresh address of the applicant was disclosed.

Submissions heard.

4. The permission was granted to the applicant on the presumption that he would not evade the enquiry/prosecution. However, it appears that the applicant is misusing the liberty granted to him. It is also observed that the application moved on behalf of he applicant has not been signed by the applicant nor any affidavit is attached.”

11. It is evident that the observations made by the learned Trial Court were in the context of submissions made by the learned SPP. Furthermore, it is also noted that learned counsel for the Applicant had himself submitted that a fresh address of the Applicant would be supplied.

12. The only observations is in regard to the evasion of enquiry prosecution, which was observed in terms of the submissions made by the learned SPP and the submissions made on behalf of the learned counsel for the Applicant. There is nothing unwarranted, stated in the Order dated 29.05.2025.

13. The Petition is hereby dismissed, and disposed of accordingly.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

DECEMBER 4, 2025/RS