



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

CWP No.25714-2024(O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.04.2026

Atul Walia

....Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. I.P.S.Kohli, Advocate (through VC)
Mr. Sidharth Maini, Advocate
for the petitioner
Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG, Punjab
Ms. Neha Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel
for Union of India

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner filed amended Memo of Parties. The same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.
2. Ms. Neha Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel has put in appearance on behalf of Union of India and waives service.
3. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to cancel Look Out Circular (for short 'LOC') issued against him.
4. On 20.02.2026, the following order was passed by this Court:

“Counsel for the petitioner states that petitioner is named as an accused in three criminal cases and LOCs have been issued on account of those cases. He states that in so far as the first criminal case is concerned, LOC has been



withdrawn. He states that in so far as the 2nd and 3rd criminal cases are concerned, as per the affidavit filed by the official respondents, LOCs have been issued to prevent the petitioner from leaving the country.

Counsel for the petitioner requests for short accommodation to place on record copies of the bail orders passed in these two cases.

List on 16.03.2026.”

5. As per affidavit dated 22.01.2025 of the respondent, LOC with respect to FIR No.62 dated 20.07.2016 has been removed, however, exists with respect to FIR No.31 dated 06.12.2019 and No.27 dated 27.12.2020. The petitioner has been released on bail in aforesaid FIRs. There are different categories of LOC. The category of LOC against the petitioner is “prevent subject from leaving India and inform originator”. Thus, the purpose of LOC is not to arrest him, however, is only to inform the originator/investigating officer about his departure.

6. Learned State counsel submits that LOC has been issued, however, petitioner would not be arrested at airport. The limited purpose of LOC in question is to get information about the departure of the petitioner.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that practice followed by Immigration Authorities is different. The persons against whom LOC is issued are normally detained and after seeking clarification from originator/investigating officer, are permitted to leave India. It causes undue harassment and sometimes leads to loss of flight.

8. In the wake of statement of learned State counsel and affidavit dated 22.01.2025 of the respondent, the petition stands disposed of with an observation that immigration staff would not detain the petitioner, however,



would be free to intimate originator/investigating officer about his departure.
There should be no harassment to petitioner because there are bail orders in his favour and he is bound to comply with the terms and conditions of the bail.

9. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

07.04.2026
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:		No