Directorate of Enforcement Vs. M/s. Sunstar Overseas Ltd. & Ors. (applicant Paramjeet @ Paramjeet Sharma)
CNR No.: DLCT01-013456-2024
CC No.: 01/2024
ECIR No.: GNZO/09/2021
Under Sections: 3, 4, 70, 44, 45(1) PMLA Act, 2002
PS.: EOW

12.01.2026
Present: Mr. Simon Benjamin, Ld. SPP for ED. *(through video conferencing)*
Mr. Samarth Krishan Luthra, Mr. Manoviraj Singh and Mr. Himanshu Mudgal, Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant, namely, Paramjeet @ Paramjeet Sharma. *(through video conferencing)*

<u>O R D E R</u>

1. The present application has been moved on behalf of the applicant/accused, namely, Paramjeet @ Paramjeet Sharma (*hereinafter referred to as the* '***applicant/accused***'), seeking permission to travel abroad, *i.e.*, to Dubai, U.A.E. for a period of 9 (nine) days *w.e.f.* 23.01.2026 to 31.01.2026 and to Germany for a period of 8 (eight) days *w.e.f.* 08.02.2026 to 15.02.2026.

2. Ld. Counsel for applicant submitted that the applicant has been arraigned as accused no. 13 in the present complaint, which is pending adjudication before this Court. As per the Ld. Counsel, the applicant has been invited to attend 'Gulfood Dubai', a leading global event for food industry professionals. In this regard, it was further averred that the said food fair offers a unique opportunity to connect with international buyers, distributors, and suppliers, explore new export markets, and discover innovative supply-chain solutions, and that the applicant's company *i.e.,* Shivakriti Agro Private Limited ('***Shivakriti***' for short), intends to exhibit their products at the event, building on the success of their participation last year. Congruently, as per the Ld. Counsel, the applicant has also

been invited to visit Germany, to attend business meetings and explore potential business prospects with key partners. Further, as per the Ld. Counsel being CEO & Director of Shivakriti, the applicant also desires to attend 'Biofach-2026 Organic Product Fair' in Nuremberg, Germany, from 10.02.2026 to 13.02.2026 to strengthen business ties and discuss future opportunities in the European market. Accordingly, under such circumstances, the applicant has moved the present application, seeking permission to travel to Dubai, UAE for a period of 9 (nine) days *w.e.f.* 23.01.2026 to 31.01.2026 and to Germany for a period of 8 (eight) days *w.e.f.* 08.02.2026 to 15.02.2026.

2.1. It was further submitted by the Ld. Counsel that subsequent to registration of the CBI case and the present ECIR, the applicant had travelled abroad on various occasions and has always timely returned to India as well as timely joined the investigation. In this regard, Ld. Counsel submitted that the applicant has been granted bail by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court *vide* order dated 07.05.2025, taking into account *inter alia* the factum of applicant's complete/full cooperation with the investigation authorities, applicant's clean antecedents, with no records of prior convictions, and a clear commitment to attending all proceedings. Correspondingly, Ld. Counsel submitted that similar permission was granted to the applicant by this Court and the applicant had duly returned on time in India. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant has thoroughly co-operated/assisted Directorate of Enforcement ('***ED***' for short) in its investigation with no evidence suggesting any flight risk or intention to interfere with the case. It was further submitted that the applicant is an upstanding member of the society with deep roots and that there is no reason to anticipate that the applicant might abscond from the law or flee from justice. It was further submitted by Ld. Counsel that the investigation *qua* the applicant has concluded, and the prosecution complaint has also been filed in the present case. Ld. Counsel further submitted that denying permission to travel abroad to the applicant would harm his professional and personal commitments, as he proposes to attend the Gulfood, Dubai, a leading global event for food industry professionals, which is crucial for his business as well as to attend business meetings at Germany. Further, as per Ld. Counsel, the applicant maintains strong familial ties in India and is committed to returning post his travel. It was further submitted by Ld. Counsel that it is settled law that the *'personal liberty'* as guaranteed to the applicant under Articles 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India *(hereinafter referred to as '**Constitution**')* includes the right to travel abroad freely and without any impairment. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant is seeking permission to travel abroad only to commit his professional duties and undertakes to comply with any and all conditions imposed by the Court. Further, as per Ld. Counsel, the applicant's business has been impaired owing to the inability of the applicant to meet with his clients and business associates and grave prejudice will be caused to the applicant if the present application is not allowed and the applicant is not permitted to travel to Dubai, UAE for a period of 9 (nine) days *w.e.f.* 23.01.2026 to 31.01.2026 and to Germany for a period of 8 (eight) days *w.e.f.* 08.02.2026 to 15.02.2026, as the applicant would be unable to attend the aforementioned event, and consequently the applicant would face loss of business, good will, and reputation which cannot be monetarily compensated.

Accordingly, it was prayed that the applicant be permitted to travel to Dubai and Germany for the aforesaid purpose.

3. *Per contra,* Ld. SPP for ED outrightly asserted that the applicant is involved in the commission of serious white-collar offence, involving, identified and qualified proceeds of crime as on date to a tune of Rs. 539 Crores, while proceeds of crime located and attached are worth Rs. 322 Crores. As per Ld. SPP, the total proceeds of crime involved is approximately Rs. 951 Crores and the proceeding in the present case are still at a nascent stage. Accordingly, as per Ld. SPP, there is still a likelihood of the applicant's tampering with the evidence and influencing the witnesses, if permitted the relief as sought for in the present application. Ld. SPP further submitted that due consideration has to be given to the fact that prosecution complaint has been filed in the present case for the offences of money laundering as specified under Sections 3/4 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (*hereinafter referred to as* '***PMLA***'). Ld. SPP further submitted that the grant of permission to applicant to travel abroad may pose a threat to the ongoing investigation as there is high possibility of obfuscation of potential proceeds of crime *via* transfer, alienation, or appropriation in guise of business transaction. Ld. SPP for ED further submitted that if the permission to travel abroad is allowed, same may compromise the final outcome of subject PMLA case, which is pending adjudication before this Court and the facts of present case involve huge amount of public money and commission of serious economic offence of money laundering, which in itself is considered to be gravest offence against the society at large and hence, the application deserves outright rejection. Even otherwise, as per Ld. SPP that against the

order dated 07.05.2025 of the Hon'ble High Court, the ED has filed a petition, bearing SLP (Crl.) *vide* diary no. 60011/2025 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and that the same is pending adjudication before Hon'ble Court.

3.1. Ld. SPP for ED further submitted that the applicant is Director and shareholder of Shivakriti and before that he was appointed as the Chief Operation Officer of the said company in November, 2017. Further, as per Ld. SPP, the applicant suddenly acquired the shareholding of the said company along with his wife and became its director in the year 2020. As per Ld. SPP, the application is key managerial person/controller of the said company, who is found to be involved in significant diversion of proceeds of crime through sham transactions. Ld. SPP further asserted that the applicant worked in concert with other co-accused and as per his statement under Section 50 PMLA, the applicant continued to provide services to Sunstar Overseas Ltd./SOL as its consultant (sales) even after he left his employment in July, 2017 and got paid, at par with his last salary. Further, as per Ld. SPP, there is overwhelming evidence against the applicant as well as his active involvement in the offence in question. Ld. SPP reiterated that the applicant, as an ex-employee of SOL and COO/director/shareholder/controller of Shivakriti, is one of the key persons, who played a significant role and facilitated the transfer of proceeds of crime through sham transactions. Correspondingly, as per Ld. SPP, the applicant also knowingly assisted in diversion and concealment of 'proceeds of crime' from Purshotam Profiles and Umaiza and knowingly became party in the offence.

3.2. Ld. SPP for ED further submitted that in case the relief as sought for his granted in favour of the applicant, there is a likelihood of the applicant evading the present proceeding as well as transferring, alienating, misappropriating the proceeds of crime in the guise of business transaction. Further, as per Ld. SPP, the applicant can make necessary arrangements for other associates to attend the said conference. Ld. SPP further submitted that the permission of the Hon'ble High Court cannot be read as a direction to this Court to allow the present application in all circumstances, rather, the same has to be a cautionary exercise. Further, as per Ld. SPP, the physical presence of the applicant is not necessary in Germany for the said meeting and that the same may be taken care of through virtual mode. As per Ld. SPP, the risk of flight and potential impact of the applicant's proposed travel ought to be given due consideration as the same is likely to derail the ongoing investigation. Ld. SPP further asserted that there are general assertions regarding potential business opportunities which are insufficient to warrant any exceptional relief in favour of the applicant. Even otherwise, it is asserted that the present application must be considered on its own merits and that the past conduct of the applicant is insignificant/immaterial for such adjudication. Ld. SPP further submitted that mere assertion of applicant's family ties, residential status, and prior instances of return from travel abroad cannot be construed as an absolute guarantee that the applicant would comply with future legal obligations, especially when there are several examples where businessman, found involved in the economic offences have misused the opportunity and fled away despite such family roots. It was further submitted that mere 'so called' cooperation with investigation officers would not preclude the necessity of travel restriction in the instant case as there is a reasonable likelihood of applicant's absconding, if permitted to travel abroad. Accordingly, Ld. SPP for ED has submitted that the present application may be dismissed. In support of said contentions, reliance was placed upon the decisions in; ***Ram Jethmalani v. Union of India, (2011) 8 SCC1; Parvez Noordin Lokhandwalla v. State of Maharashtra (2020) 10 SCC77; Indrani Mukerjea v. CBI, SLP (Crl.) No. 17027/2024 (SC); Jai Prakash Singhal v. Directorate of Enforcement, Crl. M.C 5012/2023 dated 31.10.2023(DHC); Vijay Singh Dogra v. Serious Fraud Investigation Office, Crl. M.C 4181/2024; Baba Dhondiba Misal v. State of Maharashtra Cr. Appeal No. 396/2007; Shawn Anthony Mendonca v. State of Maharashtra, Cr. Application No. 1378 of 2019; Daljit Singh Pandher v. State of Punjab & Ors., CRM-M-42836-2021; Ritika Awasty v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Ord., SLP (Crl.) 10244/2015; Nitin Sandesara v. Directorate of Enforcement & Ors., W.P. (C) 7559/2017; Mandhir Singh Todd v. Directorate of Enforcement CRL M.C 289/2023; Kanwar Deep Singh v. Directorate of Enforcement in CRL. M.C. 1748/2022;*** and ***Kanwar Deep Singh v. Directorate of Enforcement in CRL. M.C. 6638/2022; Order dated 08.12.2025 passed by Ld. Special Court in Directorate of Enforcement v. Arvind Dham & Ors. Ct. Case No. 22/2024 in I.A. No. 41/2025***.

4. The arguments of Ld. Counsel for applicant and that of Ld. SPP for ED, heard as well as case record(s) have been thoroughly perused.

5. At the outset, this Court deems it pertinent to observe that the superior courts have tirelessly avowed that right to travel abroad is of the fundamental rights, guaranteed under Articles 19 and 21 of the Constitution (***Maneka Gandhi v.***

Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597). Further, this Court deems it pertinent to refer the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, in ***E.V. Perumal Samy Redyy v. State, 2013 SCC Online Mad 4092,*** wherein the Hon'ble Court observed as under;

> *"9. It is basic that **merely because a person is involved in a criminal case, he is not denude of his Fundamental Rights. It is the fundamental of a person to move anywhere he likes including foreign countries**. One's such personal freedom and liberty cannot be abridged.[See : Article 21 Constitution of India]. In the celebrated in MENAKA GANDHI v. UNION OF INDIA [(1978) 1 SCC 248 : AIR 1978 SC 597], the Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the constitutional right of persons to go abroad. The phrase no one shall be deprived of his "life and liberty" except procedure established by law employed in Article 21, had deep and pervasive effect on fundamental right and human right. MENAKA GANTHI (supra) ushered a new era in the annals of Indian Human Rights Law. It had gone ahead of American concept of 'Due Process of Law'.*
>
> *10. But, **the fundamental right to move anywhere including foreign countries could be regulated. Where persons involved in criminal cases are wanted for investigation, for court cases, persons, who are anti-social elements their movements can be regulated**. Need may arose to apprehend persons, who have ability to fly, flee away the country. So, L.O.C. orders are issued. It is an harmonius way out between a person's fundamental right and interest of the society/state. But, in any case, it must be fair and reasonable. It should not be indiscriminate without any reason or basis."*
>
> *(Emphasis supplied)*

6. Correspondingly, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Parvez Noordin Lokhandwalla v. State of Maharashtra, (2020) 10 SCC 77,*** wherein the Hon'ble Court *inter alia* observed as under;

> *"19. In Barun Chandra Thakur v. Ryan Augustine Pinto [Barun Chandra Thakur v. Ryan Augustine Pinto, 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1899], this Court restored a condition mandating that the respondent seek prior permission from a competent court for travel abroad. The condition, which was*

originally imposed by the High Court while granting anticipatory bail was subsequently deleted by it. This Court made the following observations with respect to imposing restrictions on the accused's right to travel: (SCC OnLine SC para 9)

> *"9. ... There could be no gainsaying to that the **right to travel abroad is a valuable one and an integral part of the right to personal liberty**. Equally, however, the pre-condition of securing prior permission before travelling abroad is a crucial ingredient which undoubtedly was engrafted as a condition for the grant of anticipatory bail in this case. ... At best, the condition for seeking permission before travelling abroad could have been regulated, not deleted altogether."*

*20. This Court has passed multiple orders previously allowing an accused enlarged on bail to travel abroad. In Ganpati Ramnath v. State of Bihar [Ganpati Ramnath v. State of Bihar, 2017 SCC OnLine SC 1998], this Court allowed an accused applicant to travel abroad for medical treatment, modifying its earlier bail order, noting that the applicant had travelled abroad on the ground of medical necessity on six occasions with the permission of the court and had returned. In K. Mohammed v. State of Kerala [K. Mohammed v. State of Kerala, 2020 SCC OnLine SC 860], this Court allowed the appellant-accused to travel abroad to meet in the exigencies of a family situation. In Tarun Trikha v. State of W.B. [Tarun Trikha v. State of W.B., 2015 SCC OnLine SC 1879], this Court allowed the petitioner-accused to travel to Indonesia in connection with his employment and to return once the work was completed. In Pitam Pradhan v. State of A.P. [Pitam Pradhan v. State of A.P., 2014 SCC OnLine SC 1795], this Court while granting anticipatory bail, **permitted the petitioner to travel abroad noting that his job required him to travel abroad at frequent intervals and may lose his employment if he were not permitted to travel abroad**."*

(Emphasis supplied)

7. Correspondingly, quite recently, the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in ***Pathan Apser Hussen v. Bureau of Immigration & Ors., W.P. Nos. 27686 & 28518 of 2024, dated 06.12.2024***, noted as under;

"12. Life in the fullest sense is accomplished when the life is allowed to grow and prosper, and is let to halt only where one chooses to halt. In that sense, right to grow and prosper cannot be limited to material growth, but it extends to every aspect of life, from physical, mental, material, emotional and spiritual well-being. ***From holidaying to building relationship to professional engagement to pilgrimage and education, there can be endless human activities which can fall with in this concept, and each of them may contribute to one's growth and prosperity. The choice rests with the one who holds the right****. How one exercises one's right to life is not the concern of law as long as it is legitimate. In that sense the manner of its exercise is part of one's privacy, and that space belongs to the one who holds the right and exercises it. If so viewed, right to grow and prosper can also be seen as part of right to privacy. Eventually, whether it is considered as an independent species of right or as a limb of right to privacy,it still belongs to the family of right to life.*

*** *** ***

17. If ***right to grow and prosper is a facet of right to life, then necessarily right to travel abroad can be read not just an aspect of liberty, but also as an integral right within the right to life itself. Liberty and life do not exist in mutual exclusivity, but they fuse to define the life and its quality under the Constitution****. Having stated thus, it may have to be added that it is plainly immaterial whether right to travel abroad should be respected as an aspect of liberty or right to life. Semantics may fascinate a theoretician, but a functional Constitution considers worthy that which is eventually delivered to promote the aspirations of individuals to grow and prosper.*

18. Despite geographical barriers dividing the nations, despite the political ideologies separating human minds, the world still offers a lot to exchange within its constituent countries for mutual growth and prosperity. There is no world state, but surely there is a global village. And, every person's right to life which the Constitution protects is part of this larger scheme. ***Opportunity to grow in the contemporary world is defined by the ability to see, seek and seize an opportunity, and where there is an opportunity to grow and prosper, there surely may arise a need to travel****. Growth defies inertia and so does travel. After all, man is not a grazing cow to waste his life in the meadow of the neighbourhood.*

*** *** ***

24. ... To reiterate, if the concern of the criminal justice administration is only to ensure the participation of the accused in a criminal proceeding, then law and its administration should focus only on that, and not on any other ancillary issues affecting the personal lives and privacy of accused persons. If not, ***we may end up converting the stay of an accused person into a kind of house arrest in this country. That may not be an ideal way to understand the Constitution****. Hypothetically, if after a couple of decades, a person accused of committing a crime in India and restrained from travelling abroad and stripped of his opportunity to grow and prosper, is acquitted, will the legal system recompense him of all that he has lost?*

*** *** ***

27. Driven perhaps by the fear psychosis that everyone who gets an opportunity to travel abroad will flee, if understood in the context of the discussion above, the fears of the prosecution will blur the neutrality of the vision with a strong dose of prejudice. To state it differently, when the law requires the Court to presume the innocence of the accused, the LOC requires the Court to believe his guilt. If it is otherwise, the focus of the Office Memorandum ought to have been not to stop a person accused of an offence from travelling abroad but to ensure that he would return back to participate in the trial. In other words, the foundation for LOC rests on a faulty pivot and it very seriously requires an attitudinal shift in appreciating the very issue.

*** *** ***

35. To accomplish the purpose, the following self-operational mechanism is hereby provided :

a) In the first instance a petition should be filed before the trial Court for a direction to suspend the LOC, and to require the Court to set out the conditions for travel abroad. It may give reasons for travel, whose purpose is only to provide the setting for the Court.(Surely, this Court has all the powers to entertain a similar petition but except in cases of emergencies such as medical emergency or death; it would be advisable that petition for leave to travel is filed before the trial Court since the trial Court will have all the facts before it, which may have a bearing when it frames its conditions).

b) Once the petition is filed, the Court may not look to the reasons for travel, but should focus on the nature of conditions that may be imposed for the return of the accused person to India. Here, the *prosecution may have a right to make its statement to the Court.*

c) So far as the conditions that may be imposed are concerned, the Court may devise those, which are effective, which hold reasonable assurance that the accused may return to India, and are also workable. Some suggested conditions are:

i. To require the accused person to provide any security either by depositing a stated sum in the Court, or any property whose value may be equivalent or approximates the said sum or in addition to the said sum;

ii. To require any relative or a business associate of the accused person concerned who is a frequent traveller abroad with an active Indian passport, (the number of such foreign travel may vary from case to case, and the Court may have to satisfy itself based on each particular case) to provide surety for any stated value, and also to deposit the passport with the investigating agency (or even at the office nearer the home of the surety). Once the accused returns to India, the passport of the surety concerned should be returned to him or her. In all cases due acknowledgement must be issued by the investigating agency.

iii. The condition (i) may either be given by the accused person himself or herself, or by any other person for the accused person, which may include sureties or any other.

d) Once the conditions imposed are complied, the Court may direct the suspension of LOC during the period of travel.

e) After the first occasion, every time an accused proposes to travel abroad, he or she only needs to file a memo in the petition first filed, intimating the dates of proposed travel, and comply with the conditions originally set out. The prosecution may seek modification of any condition for any specific reasons, and the Court shall address the issue through a speaking order.

f) Once the conditions are complied with, the Originating Authority shall suspend the LOC during the period of travel, and restore it on the accused person's return to India. This method can be replicated for every travel abroad.

g) The conditions illustratively given in (c) can be substituted, if the accused person himself/herself gives anything which is equally efficacious.

h) The conditions listed above are not mandatory if the investigation agency has reasons to believe *that the accused will return to India, and conveys the same to the Court...*"

(Emphasis supplied)

8. Ergo, in light of the aforesaid judicial dictates, when the contents of the present application and the facts of the present case are scrupulously analyzed, it is observed that the applicant has specifically recorded under his application the purpose of his proposed visit, besides under para no. 6(b) of the present application, the applicant has further specified the particulars of his previous travel abroad as under;

S. No.	Country	Date of Travel
1.	Dubai	11.02.2022 to 18.02.2022
2.	Switzerland	23.11.2022 to 05.12.2022
3.	USA	08.07.2023 to 19.07.2023
4.	Thailand	13.09.2023 to 16.09.2023
5.	Mauritius	21.09.2023 to 25.09.2023
6.	Turkey	01.09.2025 to 07.09.2025
7.	Germany	02.10.2025 to 10.10.2025

9. Correspondingly, it is observed that the applicant has since been permitted bail by the Hon'ble High Court *vide* order dated 07.05.2025 *inter alia* subject to the following terms and conditions;

"...38. *In the totality of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is inclined to allow the present application. The applicant is directed to be released on bail upon his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- alongwith two sureties of like amount to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Link Court, further subject to the following conditions:-*

i. The memo of parties shows that the applicant is residing WIC-053. Wellington Estate, Sector 53. Gurugram. Haryana. In case of any change of address, the applicant is directed to inform the same to the learned Trial Court/Investigating Officer.

ii. ***The applicant shall not leave India without the prior permission of the learned Trial Court****.*

iii. The applicant is directed to give all his mobile numbers to the Investigating Officer and keep them operational at all times.

> *iv. <u>The applicant shall not, directly or indirectly. tamper with evidence or try to influence the witness in any manner</u>.*
>
> *v. In case it is established that the applicant tried to tamper with the evidence, the prosecution will be at liberty to apply for cancellation of his bail...”*
>
> *(Emphasis supplied)*

10. Markedly, in compliance of the said order, the applicant has duly submitted his bail bonds/surety, which has already been accepted by this Court, besides, the applicant is asserted to have duly joined in the investigation as well as tendered his statement(s) under Section 50 PMLA. Pertinent to further note that the applicant has earlier also traveled in past for his business purposes. Conspicuously, similar application was allowed by this Court *vide* order dated 07.08.2025, permitting the applicant to travel to Istanbul, Turkey *w.e.f.* 01.09.2025 to 07.09.2025; and *vide* order dated 25.09.2025, permitting the applicant to travel to Germany from 02.10.2025 to 10.10.2025; for his business purposes and admittedly, the applicant duly returned to India on time. At the same time, the applicant is stated to have duly joined the investigation and the said facts pertaining to the applicant’s joining the investigation, as also, tendering his statement under Section 50 PMLA have not been denied by Ld. SPP for ED/ED, however, it has been merely contended that the applicant’s travel abroad would prejudice further investigation in the present case and that the applicant may tamper with the prosecution evidence/witnesses. Further, as aforenoted, Ld. SPP has objected to the grant of permission for travel to the applicant on the ground that the offence is instant case is grave pertaining to economic offences and that the applicant’s presence in India would be difficult to be ensured,

once he is permitted to travel abroad. However, the said contention does not find favour with this Court in view of the aforesaid dictates and also for the reason that the applicant has sought for a limited duration permission to travel abroad for his business purposes. Even otherwise, this Court is also not impressed with the contention raised during the course of proceedings that the applicant may join the said event through video conferencing mode, considering that video conferencing cannot be a substitute at all the times and there may be instances where while developing business and investing money, physical presence/meetings become imperative. In fact, despite progress in technology, it cannot be negated that there may be occasions that while developing business, it may be sometimes important that one party is present before the other in person. Here, this Court deems it further apposite to reiterate that superior courts have persistently avowed that right to travel abroad is one of the basic facets of Article 19/21 of the Constitution and a fundamental right, which is even available to an accused facing trial. In fact, superior courts have, in unambiguous terms, noted that right to travel is a valuable fundamental right and can be curtailed under exceptional circumstances, which are not forthcoming at present. Correspondingly, even the Hon'ble High Court under the order dated 07.05.2025, while permitting bail to the applicant, did not absolutely restrain travel of the applicant, rather, merely directed that the applicant would not leave India without prior permission of this Court. Concurrently, in as much as the contention of Ld. SPP for ED pertaining to a challenge to the order of applicant's bail before the Hon'ble Supreme Court is concerned, it has not been brought to the notice of this Court whether any stay/order has been passed by the Hon'ble Court, limiting applicant's right to travel abroad. On the contrary, Ld. Counsel for the applicant has brought to the notice of this Court that the said challenge to the applicant's bail order has since been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 09.01.2026.

11. Accordingly, under such understanding, reverting to the facts of the present case and considering that the applicant has admittedly joined the investigation with ED, statement of the applicant under Section 50 PMLA has already been recorded; the applicant has prayed for a limited time period of travel permission, assuring his presence in India on 15.02.2026; the applicant had travel abroad and duly returned to India, on time; trial is likely to take some time, this Court deems it pertinent to ***allow*** the present application and **permit the applicant to travel to Dubai, UAE for a period of 9 (nine) days** *w.e.f.* **23.01.2026 to 31.01.2026 and to Germany for a period of 8 (eight) days** *w.e.f.* **08.02.2026 to 15.02.2026, subject to the applicant's conforming with the terms, as specified herein.** Pertinently, the applicant has already filed his flight tickets, however, the applicant is directed to abide by the other terms and conditions, as noted herein.

12. Further, **the applicant is directed to furnish one surety in a sum of Rs. 10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten Lakhs only), in the name of this Court (ASJ-03, Central, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi),** subject to the satisfaction of this Court. Further, the applicant is directed to furnish the record of Hotel booking, for his proposed travel; the details of his family members and office details, particulars of their contact details as well as his contact particulars, where he may be approached by the officials of ED during his stay abroad in the aforesaid period. Further, it is directed that **in case of change of residential address,**

particulars of contact details or office address of the applicant, he shall inform the same to the concerned officials of ED within the period of two days of such change. **The applicant is further directed to ensure that he cooperates with the concerned officials of ED during the investigation process as well as informs the concerned officials of ED, upon his return to India, within a period of 48 hours therefrom.** Further, **the applicant shall not alienate any movable or immovable assets belonging to him or to the persons related to him during the said period.** Lastly, **the applicant would also furnish in this Court, attested copy of his passport along with copy of visa of the country, where he visited, within a period of five days of his return from abroad.**

13. The application is, accordingly, ***disposed off*** in above terms.

14. A copy of this order be given ***dasti*** to Ld. Counsel for the applicant.

15. Further, a copy of this order be also given ***dasti*** to the Ld. SPP/IO for ED.

ABHISHEK GOYAL

Digitally signed by ABHISHEK GOYAL
Date: 2026.01.12 16:36:48 +0530

Abhishek Goyal
ASJ-03, Central District,
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi
12.01.2026