

**IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL JUDGE:
PC ACT (CBI) - 04, ROUSE AVENUE DISTRICT COURTS,
NEW DELHI.**

IA No.16/2025

CBI No. 30/2024 (CNR DLCT11-000071-2024)

CBI Vs. M/s Indian Technometal Co. Ltd & Ors.

(Applicant Shakti Ranjan Dash)

RC 050 2021A 0004

CBI SC-II, New Delhi

**U/s 120B r/w 420/468 & 471 IPC & 13 (2) r/w 13 (I) (d)
of P.C Act 1988**

07.08.2025

Present : Sh. Shivam Batra, Sh. Rony.O.John & Mohd. Ibrahim
Ld. Counsel for applicant/A-20 Shakti Ranjan Dash.

Sh. Hari Mohan, Ld. Sr. Public Prosecutor for
CBI /non-applicant.
IO/Dy. S.P Subhash Chandra.

Arguments heard on the application (**IA-16/2025**)
under Section 483 of BNSS 2023 already moved on behalf of
applicant/accused Shakti Ranjan Dash (A-20) seeking
modification of condition imposed vide bail order dated
03.07.2024.

ORDER

1. It is, inter alia, pleaded in the application that the applicant herein has been chargesheeted in the present case. Further, it is pleaded that he is innocent and co-operated during the course of the investigation and therefore was chargesheeted without being arrested. The applicant herein appeared before the Court consequent to issuance of summons and has been admitted to regular bail vide order dated 03.07.2024. It is further pleaded that the applicant is engaged in diverse business adventures

including exploration of mines and minerals in countries such as Cambodia, Republic of Mali, South Africa etc. Due to the said business engagement, he is required to travel frequently to the said countries. Further, it is pleaded that the imposition of condition of bail requiring prior permission of the Court, is causing hardships to the applicant as the frequent overseas travel cannot be foreseen or anticipated well in time .

1.1 Further, it is pleaded that the applicant is permanent resident of Bhubaneswar, Odisha and therefore further entails hardships in seeking the permission for traveling abroad . The said process of approaching the court is also causing unnecessary administrative and judicial burden on this court. It is further pleaded that the applicant has traveled abroad on several occasions and his applications were allowed by this Court vide orders dated 31.07.2024, 03.09.2024, 09.10.2024, 13.11.2024, 09.01.2025, 26.03.2025 and 01.05.2025. He has complied with all the conditions of travel as stipulated by the Court. Therefore, it is pleaded that the present application be allowed and the bail condition of seeking prior permission to travel abroad may be removed by altering it with a condition of filing the prior intimation of travel as well due intimation of return.

2. Per contra, the CBI in their reply has vehemently opposed the present application. It is pleaded that after completion of investigation, the chargesheet in the matter has been filed against M/s Indian Technometals and 19 others including the applicant herein who is named as A-20.

2.1 It is further pleaded that accused herein was the part of criminal conspiracy which was devised by A-2 and A-3 for routing ill-gotten money on the basis of false Letter of Credits/Bills of Landing etc. Further, it is pleaded that the grounds taken in the application are false and frivolous. The companies named by the applicant, have two more directors who can also visit abroad for business purposes. No justification is placed on record as to why he alone has to travel abroad on behalf of the company. It is further pleaded that mere the past travel history cannot be the basis of granting the permission for modification of the bail condition.

3. Ld. Counsel for the accused/applicant argued that the condition imposed in the bail order is causing unnecessary burden upon the applicant as well as on the court. As far as the requirement of the applicant only travelling abroad for business of their firms, it is submitted that in the rejoinder, he has specifically mentioned that the applicant herein is having not only vast experience but is also a qualified engineer. The visits for business of mining operations abroad involves several technical processes/discussions. The other directors who are not from the technical background cannot visit abroad for the said purposes of the said companies.

4. On the contrary, Ld. Sr. PP for CBI further in support of their opposition has argued that the matter is still at the stage of arguments on charge and therefore, any such blanket permission for travelling abroad is going to cause hindrance in the trial of the case.

5. **Heard and considered the record .**

6. The accused/applicant herein has been named as accused no.20 in the chargesheet and was summoned consequent to the order of cognizance dated 12.02.2024.

6.1 It is matter of record that the matter is still at the stage of scrutiny of documents and the arguments on charge are yet to be initiate. Therefore, in the said backdrop the presence of accused/applicant is certainly required till the matter is put on the track for trial. Any such blanket permission of travelling abroad without seeking prior permission is going to scuttle the process of the Court and putting the trial in jeopardy.

The Court also cannot lose sight of the fact that one of the main accused A-2 Rakesh Kumar Sharma is already absconding and has been declared Proclaimed Offender vide order dated 04.11.2024. In the said circumstances only while considering all the facts and material on record, the said condition seeking prior permission to travel abroad has been put in the bail order dated 03.07.2024.

7. In view of the above, no ground at this stage of the case is made out for allowing the application under Section 483 of BNSS 2023 moved on behalf of applicant/accused Shakti Ranjan Dash (A-20) seeking modification of condition imposed vide bail order dated 03.07.2024. The application (IA-16/2025) accordingly stands dismissed.

Announced in the open Court
on 07.08.2025

(GAGANDEEP SINGH)
Special Judge: PC Act, CBI-04
RADC: New Delhi: