

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI HASAN ANZAR,  
SPECIAL JUDGE, PC ACT (CBI-03),  
ROUSE AVENUE DISTRICT COURT, NEW DELHI**

*CBI Vs. Rakesh Kumar Jain @ R.K. Jain  
(Applicant/A-2 Reema Jain)  
IA No. 07/2025*

16.04.2025

Present : Shri Mandeep Singh Mann, Ld. PP for the CBI.  
Shri Deepak Bhadana, Ld. Counsel for applicant/A-2 Reema Jain.

1. This is an application seeking permission to travel to United States of America from 22.04.2025 to 15.06.2025, filed on behalf of the applicant/A-2 Reema Jain.

2. Reply filed on behalf of the CBI to the application of the applicant/A-2 Reema Jain seeking permission to travel abroad. Copy supplied to the Ld. Counsel for applicant/A-2.

3. It is contended in the application that applicant seeks permission to travel abroad from 22.04.2025 to 15.06.2025 to visit her six months grand daughter and to help her daughter-in-law with daily household work. It is further contended that applicant had previously been granted permission to travel abroad on two occasions vide orders dated 08.10.2018 and 01.08.2022. It is contended that no prejudice would be caused to the prosecution, if the applicant is permitted to travel abroad. It is further contended that applicant undertakes to remain represented before the court through her counsel during her absence so as to ensure that the proceedings are not delayed on account of her travel. It is contended that applicant has never misused the liberty granted to her and is willing to comply with any condition(s) this court may deem fit while granting permission to travel abroad.

4. Reply has been filed by the CBI to the above application of the applicant whereby the CBI/prosecution has opposed the aforesaid application stating that the reason given by the applicant to visit abroad to help her daughter-in-law with daily household work do not indicate any compelling or pressing need to visit abroad and that the right to visit abroad is not absolute and has to be reasonably explained. It is contended that there is reasonable apprehension that applicant may abscond and will not be available for the proceedings before the court, if she is permitted to go abroad.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the parties.

6. The objection of the CBI is only based on the apprehension that if the applicant is permitted to travel broad then the same would hamper the trial. The reason for such an apprehension was not supported with any material on record. The accused/applicant is presumed to be innocent till she pronounced guilty. The applicant/accused was earlier given permission to travel abroad vide orders dated 08.10.2018 and 01.08.2022 and the similar apprehensions of the CBI were considered while granting the permission to travel abroad. The applicant has given all particulars including the reason for such a visit and, therefore, considering the totality and facts and circumstances of the case, the applicant/A-2 Reema Jain is permitted to travel to United States of America from 22.04.2025 to 15.06.2025 subject to the following conditions :-

**(i) That the applicant shall furnish bank guarantee/cash security or FDR to the tune of Rs.10 Lakhs with the condition that she shall abide by the terms and conditions of this order, failing which she shall forfeit the amount to the State.**

(ii) The the applicant shall furnish personal undertaking to the court mentioning that she shall abide by the terms and conditions of this order, failing which she shall forfeit the bank guarantee or cash security or FDR to the State.

(iii) That the applicant shall file itinerary for the trip with CBI mentioning the addresses and contact number of her stay abroad.

(iv) In any eventuality, applicant/accused will not request for extension for staying abroad.

(v) She shall neither tamper with the evidence nor try to influence any witness in any manner and will not use the permission granted to her contrary to the rules.

(vi) This permission shall be subject to other applicable rules and will not be deemed as directions to any other Authority except the permission from the side of the court.

(vii) The applicant will submit the address of her stay in travel to United States of America from 22.04.2025 to 15.06.2025 alongwith telephone/contact numbers and e-mail address/s. She will also file her schedule of travel at the time of submitting FDR/Bank Guarantee/surety bond, as above.

(viii) Her surety/her counsel will undertake to accept notice(s), if any, on behalf of the applicant/accused in her absence.

(ix) She will not create any third party interest in any of her immovable properties situated in India or abroad without permission of the court during this period.

(x) Neither she nor her counsel will object to the carrying of the trial/inquiry during the absence of above accused.

(xi) In case of any of the above conditions are violated, the bank guarantee/FDR/surety bond amount shall be forfeited to the State.

(xii) The applicant shall file an undertaking that if she is required to appear physically in the court during her period of stay in abroad, then the applicant shall promptly return back to India and attend the court physically.

(xiii) That the applicant shall mark her physical presence in the court within a week from return from abroad.

(xiv) The LOC, if any, shall remain suspended till 15.06.2025. IO is directed to send necessary intimation to the appropriate authority in this regard, if required.

(xv) A separate intimation be also sent to the Deputy Director (Immigration), Bureau of Immigration, East Block-VIII, Sector-1, Rama Krishna Puram, New Delhi-110066 to take steps for suspension of LOC, if any (Vide Order dated 12.03.2024 passed by Hon'ble Delhi High Court in a case titled as "Ramesh Kumar Vs. Union of India & Anr.", W.P.(C) 3242/2024).

7. With the aforementioned observations, the application (IA No. 07/2025) stands disposed of.
8. Copy of this order be given dasti to the applicant/accused as well as CBI, as prayed.

**(HASAN ANZAR)**  
Special Judge (PC Act) CBI-03  
RADC/New Delhi/16.04.2025