

ITEM NO.31

COURT NO.1

SECTION X

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

WRIT PETITION (CRIMINAL) NO. 231/2025

VEDPAL SINGH TANWAR

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT

RESPONDENT(S)

Date : 29-05-2025 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Vikas Pahwa, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sumer Singh Boparai, Adv.
Mr. Aman Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Sirhaan Seth, Adv.
Mr. Sidhant Saraswat, Adv.
Mr. Surya Pratap Singh, Adv.
Mr. Abhilash Kr. Pathak, Adv.
Mr. Sankriti Shakuntla Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Jayesh Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Amarjeet Singh, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG

Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Adv.
Mr. Annam Venkatesh, Adv.
Ms. Chitragda Rashtravara, Adv.
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR
Ms. Nidhi Singh, Adv.
Ms. Ritika Nigam, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel, the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The grievance of the petitioner is that though he has been incarcerated for a period of one year and though a

period of six months have elapsed from the date on which he had made the application for bail, the application has not been decided by the High Court. He further submits that the matter has been adjourned on 27 occasions and even after the arguments were concluded, the same was not decided. It is submitted that this happens on some of the occasions on account of change of roster.

2. Ms Aishwarya Bhati, learned Additional Solicitor General appearing on behalf of the respondent, on the contrary, submits that it is on account of the adjournments sought by the petitioner and on several occasions the matter could not be heard. She further submits that on some occasions even after hearing the matter, the learned Judges have recused themselves for one reason or the other. She further submits that out of this one year's period, the petitioner has been on interim bail for a period of 212 days.

3. This Court time and again has emphasized the importance of speedy disposal of the matters pertaining to the liberty of the citizens. Time and again it has been said that there should not be even a single day's delay in deciding the matters relating to the liberty of the citizens.

4. We see no reason as to why the High Court should have taken such a long time in deciding the matter either way.

5. We are informed that the learned Judge of the Delhi High Court, who has seized of the matter, is sitting from 09.06.2025 to 16.06.2025.

6. We, therefore, direct the Registry of the Delhi High Court to place the matter before the learned Judge, who was taking up the matter and is sitting in the vacation Bench, on 09.06.2025 with a request to the learned Judge to decide the matter after hearing the parties forthwith.

7. The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(ANJU KAPOOR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR