



\$~131

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 82/2026**

DINESH ANEJA

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Chirag Aneja, Mr. Suraj Singh Chauhan, Advocates.**

versus

**UNION OF INDIA THROUGH BUREAU OF
IMMIGRATION & ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: **Mr. Neeraj Kumar, CGSC with
Mr. V. Naveen, Mr. Shashwat,
Advocates for UoI with Mr. Rahul
Singh.**

**Ms. Rupali B., ASC with Mr.
Abhijeet Kumar, Ms. Amisha
Gupta, Advocates for State.**

**Insp. Muneesh Kumar, SI Sakshi
Punia, PS-Ambedkar Nagar.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

13.01.2026

CRL.M.A. 776/2026 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 82/2026 & CRL.M.A. 777/2026 (interim relief)

1. By way of this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, the petitioner seeks cancellation of a Look Out Circular ["LOC"] issued against him in FIR No. 558/2016, registered at PS Ambedkar Nagar.

2. I have heard Mr. Chirag Aneja, learned counsel for the petitioner,



Mr. Neeraj Kumar, learned Central Government Standing Counsel for respondent No. 1 – Union of India, and Mr. Abhijeet Kumar, learned counsel for respondent No. 2 – the State.

3. The said FIR was registered on 19.09.2016 under Sections 376, 328 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 [“IPC”]. By order dated 21.12.2016, passed in Bail Application No. 2237/2016, the petitioner was granted anticipatory bail, *inter alia*, subject to the condition that he would not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court.

4. During the pendency of the criminal proceedings, the petitioner was permitted by the learned Trial Court to travel abroad on several occasions. Copies of some of the orders granting such permission have been placed on record.

5. The grievance raised in the present petition is that despite the petitioner having been acquitted by the learned Trial Court *vide* judgment dated 24.01.2025, and despite a subsequent order dated 07.04.2025 clarifying that the travel restriction imposed *vide* order dated 21.12.2016 stood discharged, he was stopped at the airport on 05.01.2026 and was not permitted to board a flight to the United Arab Emirates.

6. Further to order dated 12.01.2026, status reports have been handed up in Court and are taken on record.

7. The status report filed by the Bureau of Immigration places reliance on the Office Memorandum [“OM”] dated 22.02.2021 issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs, as well as the judgment of this Court in *Rahul Dilip Shah v. Union of India and Anr.* [W.P.(C) 13790/2023, decided on 05.01.2024]. It is submitted that once a LOC is issued, it continues to remain operative until a request for its modification or



deletion is received from the originating agency. In the present case, no such request was received and, consequently, the LOC remained in force.

8. The Delhi Police, in its status report, states that no direction was issued by the learned Trial Court requiring submission of a status report concerning the LOC. It is further contended that since the LOC was issued prior to the OM dated 22.02.2021, it was valid only for a period of one year.

9. The undisputed position, however, is that the petitioner was acquitted on 24.01.2025, and that by order dated 07.04.2025, the learned Trial Court expressly clarified that the condition imposed upon the petitioner *vide* order dated 21.12.2016 stood discharged.

10. It appears that the petitioner did not pursue re-call of the LOC thereafter, as no status report had been filed by the Foreign Regional Registration Office [“FRRO”].

11. Learned counsel for the respondents fairly submit that there is presently no subsisting impediment to the deletion of the LOC. Since the LOC was issued only in furtherance of the condition imposed by the order dated 21.12.2016, and the petitioner has since been acquitted, the respondents are directed to delete the LOC forthwith.

12. The facts of the present case underscore the need for better coordination between the respondent agencies to ensure that an individual’s liberty is not curtailed by the continued operation of a LOC, despite a fundamental change in circumstances. Where LOCs are issued pursuant to conditions imposed by orders granting bail, or otherwise, an appropriate mechanism must be in place for their timely deletion, once the substratum ceases to exist, whether on account of acquittal, quashing



of the FIR, or for any other legally sustainable reason. It is expected that a Standard Operating Procedure in this regard shall be evolved by the concerned agencies within a period of three months.

13. A copy of this order be communicated by learned counsel for the respondents to the Joint Director/Commissioner, Bureau of Immigration, Ministry of Home Affairs, and to the Commissioner of Police, Delhi, so that necessary steps are taken to prevent unwarranted harassment to citizens, and curtailment of personal liberty.

14. The writ petition, alongwith the pending application, is accordingly disposed of with these directions.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 13, 2026

'Bhupi'/SD/