



\$~44

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 106/2026**

BIMAL RAMGOPAL AGARWAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Akhand Pratap Singh, Ms. Samridhi Dobhal, Mr. Hritwik Maurya, Ms. Lisa Pegwal & Mr. Apoorv Paliya, Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, SC for E.D. with Ms. Priya Rai, Mr. Pawan Kumar Gangwal, Mr. Aniket Kumar Singh, Ms. Anshu Chothwani, and Mr. Harsh Kumar, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

12.01.2026

1. The present petition is directed against an order of the Additional Sessions Judge, New Delhi District, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi ["Sessions Court"], in Sessions Case No. 49/2018 dated 20.12.2025, to the extent that the Sessions Court has granted the petitioner permission to travel overseas only for the period from 05.02.2026 to 20.02.2026, for the marriage of his son.
2. The petitioner is accused of offences under Sections 3 and 4 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002. He was arrested on 11.12.2017, but was granted bail by order of the Sessions Court dated 16.03.2018. One of the conditions imposed by the Court was that the



petitioner would not leave the country without permission of the Court.

3. It is undisputed that the petitioner has, in fact, travelled overseas since, with the permission of the Court, and has returned within the time granted. In fact, in the last one year, the petitioner has travelled overseas pursuant to orders of the Sessions Court dated 11.06.2025 and 24.07.2025, and has returned within time.

4. The case with regard to the predicate offence, is pending in the State of Gujarat. In that case, by an order dated 06.10.2025 [Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 18264/2025], the High Court of Gujarat has suspended the condition prohibiting the petitioner from travelling abroad for a period of one year.

5. As far as the present proceedings are concerned, by order dated 29.11.2025, the Sessions Court permitted the petitioner to travel to Avani and Hua Hin, Thailand, from 05.02.2026 to 20.02.2026, subject to the conditions mentioned therein. It was noted that the events related to the marriage of the petitioner's son were scheduled from 11.02.2026 to 14.02.2026 at the said locations.

6. The petitioner approached this Court by way of CRL.M.C. 8778/2025, against the aforesaid order, seeking extension of the period of travel, from 15.12.2025 to 04.02.2026. By order dated 11.12.2025, the Court noted the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner that he was required to travel abroad not only to attend the wedding, but also to make necessary pre-wedding arrangements. The Court granted the petitioner liberty to approach the Trial Court for such extension.

7. Pursuant to the said order, the petitioner approached the Sessions Court, which has passed the impugned order dated 20.12.2025, rejecting



the application for extension of the period of travel. The Court declined the relief, holding that it amounts to a review of the order dated 29.11.2025 without any change of circumstances, and finding that the prayer for extension of time was vague.

8. The relief sought is opposed by Mr. Rahul Tyagi, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent, on the ground that the precise purpose of the visit has not been specified, and that the airline ticket, which has been placed on record, is for travel by the petitioner on 06.01.2026, which has now passed.

9. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I find that the rejection of the petitioner's request, which would have amounted to a visit of more than two months, was not unreasonable. However, by lapse of time, the period has now been truncated, as the wedding of the petitioner's son is scheduled to be held on 13.02.2026.

10. In the order dated 29.11.2025, the Sessions Court noted that the petitioner had been allowed to travel overseas on multiple occasions, his conduct was found to be satisfactory, he had reported back to the Court within time, and it came to the conclusion that he was not a flight risk. In the last one year, he has made two overseas trips, and has adhered to the conditions on both occasions.

11. Although Mr. Tyagi submits that the precise purpose of the extension is not mentioned, the Sessions Court has accepted the fact that the petitioner's son's wedding is scheduled for 13.02.2026. It is not unreasonable to suggest that some time for pre-wedding arrangements is required.

12. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am of the



view that a total period of travel of one month may be permitted.

13. The order of the Sessions Court dated 20.12.2025 is, therefore, set aside, and order dated 29.11.2025 is modified, to the extent that permission to travel to Avani and Hua Hin, Thailand, is granted from 21.01.2026 to 20.02.2026. The conditions mentioned in the said order shall remain unmodified. In addition, the petitioner shall furnish the final confirmed itinerary of travel, adhering to the dates mentioned above, to the Sessions Court at the time of compliance with other conditions.

14. The petition is disposed in terms of the above.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 12, 2026

SS/JM/