



\$~8

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

% *Date of Decision: 03.08.2026*

CNR No. DLHC010319872026

+ **W.P.(C) 10043/2026**

RANVIJAY SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Nupur Sharma, Mr. Gaurav Jain, Mr. Manan Popli, Mr. Atul Malhotra, Ms. Karuna Sharma, Ms. Apurva Gaur, Mr. Pramendra Singh, Mr. Mohit Kumar Bansal and Ms. Priya Tripathi, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Jagdish Chandra, CGSC with Mr. Lakshay Kumar, Ms. Maanya Saxena and Ms. Sanskriti Sharma, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

JUDGMENT

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has preferred the present writ petition seeking quashing of the Look Out Circular (**LOC**) issued against him at the instance of the Serious Fraud Investigation Office (**SFIO**) in connection with the investigation into the affairs of Jaiprakash Associates Limited (**JAL**) and its subsidiary, Jaypee Infratech Limited.



2. As set out in the petition, the petitioner herein was associated with JAL for several years and served as its Whole-Time Director from 14.12.2007 to 30.09.2023. Thereafter, he served as an Advisor with Jaypee Cement Corporation Limited from 01.10.2023 to 31.08.2025 and is presently stated to be serving as an Advisor with Mahabhadra Infrastructure Private Limited since 01.12.2025. It is stated that the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India, in exercise of its powers under Section 212(1)(c) of the Companies Act, 2013, *vide* order dated 21.04.2020, had directed an investigation into the affairs of JAL and another company and entrusted the same to the SFIO. In connection with the said investigation, the petitioner was summoned by the SFIO under Section 217 of the Companies Act, 2013 on 15.02.2021. He had appeared before the Investigating Officer and had subsequently furnished replies dated 24.02.2021 and 08.03.2021. Upon a further notice dated 18.02.2022 seeking information concerning JAL and its subsidiaries, the petitioner had furnished additional documents on 22.04.2022. Thereafter, *vide* summons dated 30.07.2025, the petitioner was again called upon to appear before the SFIO on 04.08.2025. The petitioner duly appeared and furnished a written reply dated 04.08.2025 along with the information sought from him.

3. In the meantime, at the instance of the SFIO, an LOC came to be issued against the petitioner in connection with the aforesaid investigation and has continued to remain in operation. Aggrieved by the continuation of the said LOC, the petitioner has approached this



Court by way of the present writ petition.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner argues that the continuation of the LOC against the petitioner is wholly arbitrary and unjustified. It is submitted that the petitioner has consistently cooperated with the investigation conducted by the SFIO and has appeared before the Investigating Officer whenever summoned, besides furnishing the information and documents sought from him from time to time. It is further submitted that no criminal case or FIR is pending against the petitioner, nor has any non-bailable warrant been issued against him. There is also no material to suggest that the petitioner has ever attempted to evade the investigation or that he poses any flight risk. Thus, the continued restraint on the petitioner's right to travel abroad, despite the investigation having remained pending for several years, is arbitrary and disproportionate and violative of his rights under Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

5. The learned counsel further submits that LOCs issued at the instance of the SFIO against several other persons associated with JAL and Jaypee Infratech Limited, arising out of the same investigation, have already been quashed by this Court. Reference in this regard is made to the orders passed in *W.P.(C) 6534/2023*, *W.P.(C) 14468/2021*, *W.P.(C) 3607/2022*, *W.P.(C) 4124/2023*, *W.P.(C) 7967/2022* and *W.P.(C) 1055/2024*. It is, therefore, contended that there exists no justification for continuing the LOC against the petitioner, and the same deserves to be quashed.



6. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the respondents has vehemently opposed the present petition and argued that the allegations under investigation are serious in nature. He, however, does not dispute the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation in the past and has cooperated with the investigating agency. It is also not disputed that the LOCs issued against other persons who were holding higher positions in the company have already been quashed by the Predecessor Bench. Without prejudice to the aforesaid submissions, it is stated that in case this Court is inclined to quash the LOC issued against the petitioner, the same may be made subject to similar terms and conditions as were imposed while quashing the LOCs issued against the other persons.

7. This Court has considered the submissions addressed by the learned counsel appearing for the parties and has perused the material placed on record.

8. The investigation in the present case has remained pending since the year 2020. During this period, the petitioner has joined the investigation as and when called upon to do so and has furnished the information and documents sought by the SFIO. There is no allegation that the petitioner has failed to cooperate with the investigation or has avoided appearance pursuant to any summons issued to him.

9. This Court also notes that the LOCs issued against several other Key Managerial Persons of JAL and Jaypee Infratech Limited, in connection with the same investigation, have already been quashed



by the Predecessor Bench. These include Mrs. Rekha Dixit, Whole-Time Director of Jaypee Infratech Limited, *vide* order dated 03.02.2026 in W.P. (C) 6534/ 2023; Mr. Pankaj Gaur, Joint Managing Director of JAL, *vide* order dated 11.03.2026 in W.P. (C) 14468/2026; Mr. Sunny Gaur, Managing Director of JAL, *vide* order dated 17.04.2026 in W.P. (C) 3607/ 2022; and Mr. Sameer Gaur, Joint Managing Director of Jaypee Infratech Limited, Mr. Sachin Gaur, Whole-Time Director and CFO of Jaypee Infratech Limited, and Mr. Rakesh Sharma, Managing Director of Jaypee Infratech Limited, *vide* orders dated 08.05.2026 in W.P. (C) 4124/ 2023, 7967/ 2022 and 1055/ 2024.

10. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, particularly the petitioner's cooperation with the investigation and the fact that LOCs issued against other persons holding senior managerial positions in the aforesaid companies, arising from the same investigation, have already been quashed, this Court finds no reason to continue the LOC against the petitioner.

11. Accordingly, the LOC issued against the petitioner at the instance of the SFIO is hereby quashed, subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The Petitioner shall co-operate with the ongoing and/or future investigations, if any, instituted at the behest of the concerned investigation agency.
- (ii) The Petitioner shall be entitled to travel abroad without any prior permission from this Court. The Petitioner



shall, however, intimate the Investigation Officer, with its full itinerary either personally or through counsel, at least 7 days prior to his departure.

- (iii) If, in case of emergency, where intimation cannot be given as aforesaid, the petitioner shall give the requisite intimation at least 24 hours prior to the travel.
- (iv) If the chargesheet is filed, the Petitioner shall approach the concerned Court and thereafter, shall take the permission for travelling abroad.
- (v) The SFIO shall be at liberty to seek issuance of a fresh LOC in accordance with law, if any supervening circumstances or new material warrants such action.

12. With these directions, and conditions, the LOC stands set aside.

13. Let the necessary communication be made by the SFIO, to Immigration Bureau.

14. Accordingly, petition along with pending applications, stands disposed of.

15. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

AUGUST 03, 2026/ns

TD