



\$~104

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4424/2026**

MEENAKSHI SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Singh Chauhan and Mr.
Arindam Bharadwaj, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vishwa Pal Singh, CGSC with
Mr. Anurag Pandey and Mr. Abhijit
Singh, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

06.04.2026

CM APPL. 21728/2026 (EXEMPTION)

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4424/2026 and CM APPL. 21727/2026

3. The instant petition has been filed seeking following prayers:

"i. Issue a writ of mandamus/certiorari, or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, quashing the Look-Out Circular (LOC) issued against the Petitioner by the Respondents;
ii. Direct the Respondents to forthwith withdraw or set aside the LOC and intimate all immigration checkpoints accordingly;
iii. Direct the Respondents to allow the Petitioner to travel abroad without any restrictions being imposed or coercive steps being taken against her;
iv. Permit the Petitioner to travel abroad in the interim on conditions as may be deemed appropriate by this Hon'ble Court, particularly in view of



*the Petitioner's professional commitments as stated in detail hereinabove;
v. Pass any other order(s) as may be deemed just, fit, and proper in the
interest of justice."*

4. As per the decision by this Court in the case of **Sumer Singh Salkan v. Asstt. Director**¹, it is found that one of the directions contained therein empowers the concerned court, where the matter is pending to decide the LOC if the petitioner justifies that there is no necessity to keep the LOC operational. Paragraph no. 11 of the said decision is extracted as under:

"11. Look-out-Circular has also been issued against the petitioner as the petitioner is an accused the Court of M.M. and he has not appeared the Court of M.M. If the petitioner gives an undertaking the court for his appearance on a particular date, through his counsel, the Look-out-Circular issued against the petitioner shall be withdrawn within 24 hours of giving undertaking by the petitioner.

The questions raised in the reference are as under:

"A. What are the categories of cases in which the investigating agency can seek recourse of Look-out-Circular and under what circumstances?

B. What procedure is required to be followed by the investigating agency opening a Look-out-circular?

C. What is the remedy available to the person against whom such Look-out-Circular has been opened?

D. What is the role of the concerned Court when such a case is brought it and under what circumstances, the subordinate courts can intervene?

The questions are answered as under:

A. Recourse to LOC can be taken by investigating agency in cognizable offences under IPC or other penal laws, where the accused was deliberately evading arrest or not appearing in the trial court despite NBWs and other coercive measures and there was likelihood of the accused leaving the country to evade trial/arrest.

B. The Investigating Officer shall make a written request for LOC to the officer as notified by the circular of Ministry of Home Affairs, giving details & reasons for seeking LOC. The competent officer alone shall give directions for opening LOC by passing an order in this respect.

C. The person against whom LOC is issued must join investigation by appearing I.O. or should surrender the court concerned or should satisfy the court that LOC was wrongly issued against him. He may also approach the officer who ordered issuance of LOC & explain that LOC was wrongly issued against him. LOC can be withdrawn by the

¹ 2010 SCC OnLine Del 2699



authority that issued and can also be rescinded by the trial court where case is pending or having jurisdiction over concerned police station on an application by the person concerned.

D. LOC is a coercive measure to make a person surrender to the investigating agency or Court of law. The subordinate courts' jurisdiction in affirming or cancelling LOC is commensurate with the jurisdiction of cancellation of NBWs or affirming NBWs."

5. Mr. Amit Singh Chauhan, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has already approached the Court of competent jurisdiction. If that be so, let the petitioner's application be dealt with by the concerned Court in accordance with law.
6. Let the petitioner's application be expeditiously disposed of.
7. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of.
8. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 6, 2026/Sh