

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**Cr.M.P. No. 2278 of 2025**

Rahul Yadav, age 21 years old, son of Rajesh Yadav,  
resident of Village-Sobhanpur Bhatta, P.O. and P.S.-  
Sahibganj, District-Sahibganj.

..... ... Petitioner  
Versus  
Union of India through ED  
..... ... Opposite Party

-----  
**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI**

-----  
For the Petitioner : Mr. Sabyasanchi, Advocate.  
For the ED : Mrs. Dr. Vandana Singh, Advocate.  
-----

**04/ 08.05.2026** This petition has been filed for modification of the order dated 16.08.2024, passed in B.A. No. 1465 of 2024 by this court.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that condition No. 7(c) may kindly be modified to the extent that the petitioner will appear before the learned court on the substantial date of trial. He next submits that the petitioner is pursuing his study at Sahibganj and travelling from Sahibganj to Ranchi to appear on each and every date before the learned court is harsh. On these grounds, he submits that the said condition may kindly be modified.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the ED vehemently opposes the prayer and submits that the notice has been deliberately evaded by the petitioner and further not co-operated in the investigation. She submits that due to said non-co-operation, the petitioner is at a flight risk. She next submits that willfully the petitioner has ignored multiple summonses issued under Section 50 of the PMLA, 2002, on 26/07/2022, 16/08/2022, 01/09/2022, 01/10/2022, and 14/11/2022 respectively and thereafter the learned court was compelled to issue the Non-Bailable Warrant (NBW) of arrest against him on 06/04/2023 and after that only, the petitioner has surrendered before the learned court on 02/01/2024, after his petition seeking the cancellation of the NBW

was denied by the High Court. She submits that this prolonged period of evasion demonstrates his clear intent to frustrate the legal process and further during custodial interrogation, the petitioner has provided evasive and misleading replies claiming the funds were loans, but failing to provide any details or documentation to substantiate his claims. On these grounds, she submits that there is no need of modification of condition No. 7(c) of the order dated 16.08.2024, passed in B.A. No. 1465 of 2024 by this court, as such, this petition may kindly be dismissed.

4. The petitioner was granted regular bail by order dated 16.08.2024, passed in B.A. No. 1465 of 2024 by this court, which is as under:-

*(7).....(a) The petitioner shall furnish his mobile number and photocopy of the Aadhar Card with an undertaking that he will not change his mobile number during the pendency of the case.*

*(b) The petitioner will not disturb or annoy the informant or witness related to this case in any manner during the pendency of the case.*

*(c) The petitioner shall appear before the trial court on each and every date of the trial.*

*(d) The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence and shall not threaten the witnesses.*

*(e) Any such other conditions as the trial court deems fit other than the condition of requiring pre-deposit.*

5. What has been noted in the argument of learned counsel appearing for the ED, which clearly suggests that the petitioner is at a flight risk, as earlier the petitioner had evaded the summons and he had not appeared before the learned court and thereafter the learned court has issued the Non-Bailable Warrant of arrest and when the High Court

has not interfered with the said Non-Bailable Warrant of Arrest and thereafter only, the petitioner has surrendered before the learned court.

6. Considering all these aspects, *prima facie* the court finds that the petitioner is at a flight risk and the prayer made in the present petition is misconceived one. As such, this petition is dismissed.

**(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)**

Dated:-08.05.2026  
Amitesh/-