



2026:DHC:1471



\$~59

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: 18th February, 2026*

+ CRL.M.C. 1391/2026 & CRL.M.A. 5558/2026

ARUN ANAND

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rahul Mehra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Atul Kumar, Ms. Sweety Singh,
Mr. Chaitanya Gosain, Mr. Hanif
Chimthanawala, Mr. Harsh Kumar
and Ms. Meenakshi, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State
with SI Abhishek, PS EOW.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. A chargesheet was filed in relation to FIR No.113/2019, dated 25.06.2019, registered at PS EOW for offences under Section 420/406/120-B IPC.
2. Petitioner herein is one of the accused in the abovesaid case.
3. The case is, reportedly, at the stage of consideration of charge.
4. When the petitioner herein i.e Mr. Arun Anand sought regular bail, the bail was granted to him by the learned Trial Court on 30.04.2022 with certain conditions. One of the conditions was that the accused shall not leave the country, without prior permission of the Court.
5. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a Chartered Accountant in his seventies and he has to travel abroad frequently



2026:DHC:1471



and, on various previous occasions, when he had sought permission from the learned Trial Court, he left the country with due permission and returned back as per the itinerary. He submits that, at times, in case of exigency, it becomes difficult to comply with the terms, well in advance and, therefore, there is a request to waive off or relax the abovesaid condition.

6. It is submitted that if the condition is relaxed, the petitioner would, in any case, give prior intimation about his proposed trip with complete itinerary and details of his stay, contact numbers, etc. He also submits that since the identity of the petitioner is not disputed, he is even ready to file an affidavit to the abovesaid effect and his counsel can always represent him in the abovesaid matter, unless where there is a specific direction for him to appear in person. It is thus prayed that the abovesaid condition may be substituted by mere direction to him to give prior information about his travel.

7. When asked, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, in all fairness, submitted that they have come to this Court directly for the modification of the abovesaid bail order, without filing any application to the abovesaid effect before the learned Trial Court.

8. After hearing arguments for some time, learned Senior Counsel, on instructions, submits that he does not press the present application and seeks liberty to file appropriate application with similar request before the learned Trial Court. He submits that, however, if the learned Trial Court does not accede to the abovesaid request, the petitioner may be permitted to come to this Court again.

9. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of as not pressed.

10. Liberty as prayed for, is granted.

11. Learned Trial Court is also requested to consider the abovesaid request,



2026:DHC:1471



sympathetically, keeping in mind the age of the petitioner as well as the fact that, on all previous occasions, he, reportedly, adhered to the itinerary.

12. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

13. Pending application also stands disposed of.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 18, 2026/st/sa