



2026:DHC:4162



\$~4

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1055/2024**

Date of Decision: **08.05.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

RAKESH SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tanmay Mehta, Ms. Manisha Parmar, Ms. Aadrijaa Sonik, Mr. Rahul Yadav Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Shiva Lakshmi (SPC) Mr. Pravar Dennison adv. Ms. Urvi Tripathi, Advts.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

JUDGEMENT

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed for quashing the Look Out Circular issued against the petitioner at the instance of Serious Fraud Investigation Office [SFIO].
2. The petitioner, an IIT Roorkee Graduate, joined the Jaypee group in 1992 and worked primarily in hydropower sector for about 25 years. He held directorship in various Jaypee Group companies including Jaiprakash Associates Limited and Jaypee Infratech Limited and served as whole-time-director in Jaypee Infratech Limited from 01.04.2012 to 01.07.2017. He has



2026:DHC:4162



been employed as Chief Technology Officer at M/a Kram Infracon Private Limited since February, 2021.

3. On 15.02.2021, the petitioner received the first summons from SFIO issued approx. 3 months after the LOC had been issued. In furtherance thereof, the petitioner appeared on 24.02.2021. He cooperated fully, had his statement recorded and on 09.03.2021 submitted additional information as orally directed. Subsequently, further summons were issued by SFIO from time to time, all of which were duly complied with.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that he has cooperated in the investigation and his statement was also recorded by the Investigating Officer. It is submitted that even during the pendency of the writ petition, the petitioner was allowed to travel abroad *vide* orders dated 26.02.2024 and 28.02.2024.

5. The submissions of the petitioner are opposed by Mr. Syed Abdul Haseeb, learned counsel appearing for the respondents and he contends that keeping in mind the seriousness of the allegations, the Court may not consider to quash the LOC.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as narrated hereinabove, the Court is of the opinion that the factual matrix evinced in the instant *lis* is covered by the decision of this Court in ***Ritu Singal V. Bureau Of Immigration & Ors.***¹ The purpose of issuance of the LOC, as of now, having been sufficiently served and there being no material against the petitioner to indicate any overact or non-cooperation, the impugned LOC deserves to be set aside, subject to the following directions:

¹ 2026:DHC:3806



2026:DHC:4162



- a. The petitioners shall be entitled to travel abroad without any prior permission of this Court. The petitioners shall, however, intimate and provide the full itinerary to the concerned department/agency, either personally or through counsel, at least 48 hours prior to their departure; and
 - b. If, on account of a change in law, or any other supervening event, including a declaration by a Court, the respondents shall be at liberty to seek the issuance of LOCs in accordance with law.
 - c. The SFIO is directed to inform the Bureau of Immigration regarding, *inter alia*, the quashing of the LOCs against the respective petitioners, and to take all necessary steps to ensure that the petitioners are not impeded from travelling abroad. The petitioner shall also be at liberty to send such communication to the Immigration Department independently.
7. With these directions, and conditions, the LOC stands set aside.
 8. Let the necessary communication be made by the SFIO, Immigration Bureau.
 9. Petition along with pending applications stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

MAY 8, 2026/P