



2025:DHC:2791



\$~70

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

% *Date of Decision: 22.04.2025*

+ **CRL.M.C. 2650/2025 & CRL.M.A. 11913/2025**

NICE (SOCIETY) TRUST

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajeet Shukla and Ms. Noor  
Alam, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State with  
Inspector Amit Pratap, PS EOW

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

**J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. Petitioner has filed this petition seeking cancellation of bail granted to the respondent no.2 vide Order dated 18.05.2022 of the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. Having heard learned counsel for petitioner at length, I do not find it a fit case to even issue notice.

2. Broadly speaking, the ground on which cancellation of bail is sought by petitioner is that respondent no.2 left NCT of Delhi without informing the SHO concerned and did not drop a pin location on Google Maps so that his location could be available to the Investigating Officer.



2025:DHC:2791



3. Learned counsel for petitioner has taken me through the Bail Order dated 18.05.2022 (*Annexure-B*) and it is contended by him that for violation of the above mentioned conditions, bail granted to respondent no.2 is liable to be cancelled. Learned counsel for petitioner has also taken me through paragraphs 6 and 13 of the Bail Order and it is submitted by him that once the Co-ordinate Bench took a view that there were issues which required trial, there is no need for Trial Court to hear arguments on charge, but that is being done and the trial is being delayed. No other ground for cancellation of bail has been raised.

4. Learned APP on instructions of Investigating Officer/Inspector Amit Pratap Singh submits that respondent no.2 had informed the Investigating Officer about his travel to Goa and had also informed his plan to return to Delhi prior to date of hearing before the Trial Court. It is further submitted by the Investigating Officer that respondent no.2 also sent his Google pin.

5. As reflected from the Bail Order, the present respondent no.2 was kept in column no. 12 and chargesheet was filed without arresting him. It is only after being summoned by the Trial Court that the present respondent no.2 approached this Court for anticipatory bail. It is nobody's case that respondent no.2 in any manner misused the liberty granted to him. Merely for the reason (*which reason also does not appear to be correct in view of*



2025:DHC:2791



*above submission of the Investigating Officer)* that respondent no.2 did not inform the SHO concerned about his travel outside NCT of Delhi, given the present case of such peculiar nature, it cannot be said to be a case of misuse of liberty. In any case, as mentioned above, the Investigating Officer has submitted that he had information about travel of respondent no.2 out of Delhi and it is only that he could not return prior to the date fixed before the Trial Court.

6. Considering the above circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to deprive respondent no.2 the liberty already granted to him. The petition as well as pending application are dismissed.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**APRIL 22, 2025/DR**