

ITEM NO.34

COURT NO.1

SECTION II-C

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

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRIMINAL) Diary No(s). 23710/2022

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 30-03-2022 in CRLP No. 1189/2022 passed by the High Court Of Karnataka At Bengaluru)

ENFORCEMENT OF DIRECTORATE

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

MADHUKAR G. ANGUR

Respondent(s)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.121184/2022-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.121185/2022-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.121187/2022-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 19-09-2022 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY RASTOGI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Tushar Mehta ,SG
Mr. S.V. Raju, ASG
Mr. Jayant K. Sud, ASG
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR
Mr. Zoheb Hussain Adv
Mr. Annam Venkatesh Adv
Mr. Kanu Agarwal Adv
Mr. Kartik Jasra Adv

For Respondent(s)

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

Delay condoned.

The present Special Leave Petition challenges the order granting bail to the respondent-accused in connection with crime registered pursuant to ECIR No.BGZ0/33/2020 in respect of offences punishable under Section 5(1) of the Prevention

of Money- Laundering Act, 2002.

It appears that in the scheduled offences, the respondent-accused, after some period of custody, was granted benefit of bail. Further, in other connected matters, he was also granted the benefit of anticipatory bail.

The present order granting bail came to be passed after the respondent-accused had completed more than 2½ months of custody.

In the peculiar facts of the present case, in our view, the order granting bail needs no interference by this Court. We, therefore, reject this Special Leave Petition.

We however, grant liberty to the present petitioner to place such circumstances on record which in the opinion of the petitioner would deserve consideration for cancellation of order granting bail.

It must be stated here that according to the petitioner, after his release on bail, the respondent accused has been in touch with some of the witnesses and is trying to pressurize such witnesses. On this score, the petitioner will certainly be entitled to approach the Court for appropriate relief. As and when such application is preferred, the Court shall consider it purely in accordance with law.

It has also been submitted that while granting bail, the condition with regard to deposit of Pass-port was not imposed

by the concerned Court. Even on this score, the petitioner will be entitled to approach the Court and seek appropriate variation in the conditions granting bail.

With these observations, the Special Leave Petition is dismissed.

Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(INDU MARWAH)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(VIRENDER SINGH)
BRANCH OFFICER