



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206

CWP-32173-2025
Date of decision: 24.03.2026

NALIN KUMAR SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Swapnil Srivastava, Advocate,
(Through Video Conferencing),
Mr. Parvez Memon, Advocate
Mr. Kush Agarwal, Advocate and
Mr. Jaiveer Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Omkar Singh Wahla, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India with
Mr. Neha Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel and
for respondent No.2-Union of India.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Challenge in the present petition is to the Look Out Circular issued by respondent No.2 against the petitioner in case arising in FIR No. 171 dated 18.09.2025 registered under Sections 318(4) and 61 of BNS at Police Station DLF-II, Gurugram.

2. On 03.12.2025, the following order was passed:-

“The instant application has been filed for seeking

permission to travel to Indonesia from 02.12.2025 to 18.12.2025, however, since the application has been listed after the aforesaid date, hence, the prayer is confined to grant of permission to travel abroad for a period of 15 days w.e.f the date as this Court may deem appropriate.

Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-applicant contends that the applicant-petitioner is the CEO, Co-Founder & Director of PT Orbit Ventura Indonesia (Brand Name: Orbit Future Academy). Being an Indian citizen and for carrying out business in the territory of Indonesia, he needs work/stay permits issued by the Department of Immigration, Indonesia. Reference in this regard is based on Article 48 (1) @ (@ 128) read with Article 61 (@ 135) of Law No.6 of 2011 of Indonesia which mandates existence of such work permit as a pre-requisite to carry out any professional activity in Indonesia. He contends that the said stay permit issued in favour of the petitioner expired on 03.11.2025 and is required to be renewed, failing which the petitioner would suffer serious prejudice, including not only the forfeiture of the security deposit furnished at the time of applying for the permit in 2020 on account of non-renewal within stipulated period, but also imposition of daily fine of Rs. 5400/- per day of delay. Further, the petitioner would be required to step down from all his positions until he gets his stay permit renewed. Thus, the petitioner would also lose out on the salary for the said time period. Apart from this, he will have to vacate his rented residential premises in Indonesia and will have to relocate. In addition thereto, there is also a possibility of the petitioner being placed in a “deterrence list”. He contends that the petitioner holds eminent position in the companies he works for and he is therefore required to sign pay-cheques of the employees working in the company. On account of his inability to travel, such payments are yet to be made for the month of November. He further contends that the travel of the petitioner is thus for ensuring safety of his business interests and to ensure

that he does not lose his livelihood. He submits that the period of renewal is likely to take nearly 10 to 14 days, hence, the prayer is being confined to grant of a travel permission for a period of 2 weeks from today. It is also additionally submitted that the respondent- State of Haryana had also asked for certain bank related documents which the petitioner is required to source from Bank in Indonesia as the soft copy of the bank record which is more than 01 month old has not been furnished and the laws mandate supply of hard copies only. He contends that since the petitioner joined investigation in the present case on 29.11.2025 and these documents are required, hence, even for completion of investigation, he is required to travel to Indonesia so as to furnish the relevant evidence as desired for.

Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner contends that he is on instructions to state that the petitioner may be put to any conditions so as to ensure his presence after the expiry of the period of permission granted by this Court.

Counsel appearing on behalf of Union of India contend that an LOC had been issued on the request of the respondent-State of Haryana and that they would have no serious objection to the prayer made by petitioner.

Counsel appearing on behalf of the State of Haryana submits that the petitioner had joined investigation on 29.11.2025, pursuant to an order passed by this Court, however, certain documents including bank accounts details and transactions have been asked for which have not been furnished by him so far. Thus, the statement made by the Senior Counsel for petitioner regarding bank account details sought for by the Investigating Agency stands corroborated. The State does not express any grave apprehension of the petitioner being a flight risk or absconding from process of law.

Having heard Counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances, I deem it appropriate to allow the instant application. The petitioner is

*accordingly granted permission to travel abroad for a period of 15 days commencing **from 06.12.2025 till 22.12.2025** on his furnishing surety bonds to the sum of Rs. 20 lakhs before the Illaqa Magistrate. He shall also furnish an undertaking giving details of the place where he intends to reside during his stay in Indonesia alongwith his contact number. Additionally, the petitioner shall report before the Illaqa Magistrate on or by 24.12.2025 after his return.*

Let a copy of this order be handed over to the Counsel for the respective parties under the signatures of the Bench Secretary for enabling him to travel abroad.

3. Thereafter, even on second occasion, similar permission to travel abroad was granted by this Court vide its order dated 19.01.2026 which reads thus:-

“The instant application has been filed on behalf of the applicant seeking permission to travel abroad to Colombo, Sri Lanka from 20.01.2026 to 23.01.2026 and thereafter to Jakarta, Indonesia from 23.01.2026 to 06.02.2026.

Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant-petitioner contends that the petitioner had approached this Court even on earlier occasion vide CM-17546-2025 seeking permission to travel to Indonesia from 02.12.2025 to 18.12.2025 for renewal of his work permit. After considering the averments of the applicant, he was granted permission to travel abroad from 06.12.2025 to 22.12.2025 on the following conditions:-

“A. The Applicant shall furnish surety bonds to the sum of INR 20 lakhs before the Illaqa Magistrate.

B. The Applicant shall also furnish an undertaking giving details of the place where he intends to reside during his stay in Indonesia along with his contact number.

C. Further, the Applicant shall report before the Illaqa Magistrate on or by 24.12.2025 after his return.”

Learned Senior Counsel contends that in compliance to the said order, the petitioner submitted his travel itinerary and returned on 19.12.2025 i.e. before the last date and got his presence marked in the Court of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gurugram. He contends that on account of his business commitments, the petitioner is required to travel yet again for the period from 20.01.2026 to 06.02.2026 first to Colombo (Sri Lanka) and thereafter to Jakarta (Indonesia) as per the Itinerary extracted as under:-

- A. Delhi, India to Colombo, Sri Lanka from 20.01.2026 to 23.01.2026;*
- B. Colombo, Sri Lanka to Jakarta, Indonesia from 23.01.2026 to 06.02.2026.*
- C. Jakarta, Indonesia to Delhi, India on 06.02.2026.*

Learned Counsel contends that after his return, the applicant-petitioner has also joined the investigation and handed over documents as were asked for by the Investigating Officer. He contends that the applicant-petitioner shall return as per the travel Itinerary and appear before the Illaqa Magistrate on or by 13.02.2026.

Learned State Counsel on verification of averments contained in the application and on instructions from ASI Sunil/Investigating Officer, Belt No. 210/GGM does not dispute the facts noticed above.

*Consequently, the instant application is allowed and the applicant is granted permission to travel abroad for the period commencing from **20.01.2026 to 06.02.2026** on his furnishing surety bonds to the sum of Rs. 20 lakhs before the Illaqa Magistrate. He shall also furnish an undertaking giving details of the place where he intends to reside during his stay in*

Colombo (Sri Lanka) as well as Jakarta (Indonesia) alongwith his contact number. Additionally, the applicant-petitioner shall report before the Illaqa Magistrate on or by 13.02.2026 after his return on 06.02.2026.

Let copy of this order be handed over to the Counsel for the respective parties under the signatures of the Bench Secretary for enabling him to travel abroad.

4. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that Look Out Circular is ordinarily issued where a person is not joining investigation or associating with the same and there is a strong possibility of flight risk. He submits that the petitioner has already joined investigation and his anticipatory bail already stands confirmed in CRM-M-66856-2025. Thus it cannot be assumed that the petitioner is absconding from the process of law. The LOC has thus been issued against the petitioner only for the reasons that the petitioner is a frequent traveller and there was a possibility of the petitioner absconding from the process of law. The said apprehension or suspicion is no longer well founded and is misplaced. He further contends that the petitioner would in any case be bound by the terms and conditions as prescribed under Section 482 (2) BNSS in relation to his travels abroad. Considering the facts that he is on bail, the exigency of work and that he has already joined investigation and has clean antecedents, there is no reason for keeping the LOC open against the petitioner herein.

5. Learned State Counsel is not in a position to give any valid justification for keeping the LOC open more so when the only apprehension expressed by the respondent-State is that of the petitioner absconding from the process of law whereas sufficient safeguard has already been prescribed under Section 482(2) BNSS.

6. In view of the undisputed facts as aforesaid, the clean antecedents of the petitioner, he having travelled abroad on permission granted by this Court and having come back on time and surrendering before the authorities alongwith the fact that the petitioner has been granted concession of pre-arrest bail by this Court, I find no valid justification for keeping the LOC open and surviving against the petitioner. Consequently, the letter dated 13.10.2025 confirming issuance of LOC against the petitioner herein by the respondent No.2 is set aside. The State is further directed to withdraw its request for LOC against the petitioner, in the present case. The present petition is accordingly allowed.

7. The petitioner shall nonetheless remain bound to comply with the terms and conditions as prescribed under Section 482(2) BNSS.

MARCH 24, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No