



\$~38, 39 & 60

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2751/2025

SANJEEV KUMAR GARG AND ORS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arjun Malik, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP for
State.

Mr. Bhuvnesh Mittal, Advocate for
R-2.

SI Anjali Tomar.

39

+ CRL.M.C. 2791/2025

SAURABH GARG

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arjun Malik, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP for
State.

Mr. Bhuvnesh Mittal, Advocate for
R-2.

SI Anjali Tomar.

60

+ W.P.(CRL) 4274/2025

SAURABH GARG



.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Arjun Malik, Advocate.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP for
State.
Mr. Bhuvnesh Mittal, Advocate for
R-2.
SI Anjali Tomar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

29.07.2026

CRL.M.C. 2751/2025 and CRL.M.A. 12339/2025, CRL.M.A. 7383/2026
CRL.M.C. 2791/2025 and CRL.M.A. 12486/2025

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.2 -wife prays for time on the ground that he is out of Delhi.
2. Acceding to the aforesaid prayer, list on 17.11.2026.

W.P.(CRL) 4274/2025

3. The parents of the petitioner are present before the Court.
4. The Look Out Circular (LOC) had been issued to secure the presence of the petitioner. The petitioner undertakes to appear through Video Conferencing before the concerned Investigation Officer.
5. In view of the aforesaid, if the petitioner cooperates, let the respondents to consider rescinding the LOC.
6. In view of the fact that they are residing in India, and since the petitioner as well as the parents are all agreeable to appear before the



Investigating Officer, the Court finds that there is no reason to deny the petitioner to travel India.

7. Accordingly, the LOC against the petitioner shall remain suspended in interregnum.

8. List on 17.11.2026.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

JULY 29, 2026

aks