

Bail No.561/2026
CC No. 02/2026
ECIR/STF/33/2025
PS Jamia Nagar
PS Crime Branch Inter State Cell Chanakya Puri
U/s 318(4)/336(2)/336(3)/336(4)/338/340(2)/61(2) BNS 2023
& 3 PMLA 2002
ED Vs. Jawad Ahmed Siddiqui

07.03.2026

Present : Sh. Simon Benjamin Ld. Spl. PP for ED.
Sh. Dilipan. N, Deputy Director for ED.
Sh. Rahul Saini, Ld. Counsel on behalf of Ld. Spl. PP for ED.
Sh. Arshdeep Singh Khurana, Ld. Counsel for accused appearing through VC.
Sh. Talib Mustafa, Abhishek Singh, Dr. Shahzad Ahmad, Sh. Vishvendra Tomar, Sh. Ketan Kumar Roy, Sh. Shubh Mathur, Sh. Harsh Srivastava, Ms. Diksha Ramnani, Sh. Chetan Nagpal Ld. Counsels for accused.

1. Today, the matter is fixed for consideration on application U/s 45 of Prevention of money laundering Act seeking interim bail on urgent medical and humanitarian grounds.
2. This is an application moved on behalf of accused/ applicant Jawad Ahmad Siddiqui U/s 45 PMLA R/w Section 483 of BNSS for seeking interim bail on the ground of critical illness of his wife namely Mrs. Usma Akhtar who is currently suffering from stage IV Metastatic Carcinoma of the ovary and is undergoing active, aggressive and third line chemotherapy at Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi. It has been argued that the applicant is in custody since 18.11.2025 and his wife who is aged around 52 years is battling cancer which is in progression. Further, that the

wife of the applicant is undergoing third line of chemotherapy. It has been argued that due to the applicant being in custody, the wife of the applicant has been living alone without any care, moral support and companionship and requires the applicant during the aforesaid treatment. It has been argued that the wife of the applicant had undergone debulking surgery on 27.06.2024 and thereafter, has been taking sessions for chemotherapy. Ld. Counsel for the applicant has relied upon the documents pertaining to the medical treatment for the aforesaid ailment of Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi. It has been argued that the next date for the chemotherapy is scheduled for 12.03.2026. Ld. Counsel has also relied upon the discharge summary of the wife of the accused/applicant dated 26.02.2026 in this regard stating that the condition of the wife of the applicant is serious and she requires care and support. It has also been argued that the accused/applicant being the husband is the primary care giver and his support during the aforesaid ailment is required. It is argued that the parents of the accused/ applicant had already expired and the wife of the accused/ applicant is survived by old age mother, who is 75 years of age.

3. It is further argued that the applicant has three children who are residing in UAE since the year 2017. Further, the elder son is 26 years old and is running business in UAE since 2017 and the other 2 children are aged 17 years and daughter aged 21 years, who are

studying in UAE. Further, the younger son is pursuing class 12th and is currently giving his board exams and the daughter is pursuing her studies from Sharja UAE and are unable to travel to India. It is argued that there are no other adult family members of the wife of the applicant who can look after her during the aforesaid treatment. It is argued that the accused/ applicant is required for physically accompanying the wife to the hospital for visits and admission as well as for helping her take treatment for chemotherapy. It is argued that the accused/ applicant shall be required to take care of the wife during her medication at home as well as for emotional, psychological and moral support as wife of accused is battling terminal cancer stage IV.

4. It has also been argued that Article 21 of Constitution of India guarantees the life to liberty to accused/ applicant which involved right to health to himself as well as to his family. It has also been argued that the principle of twin condition as required U/s 45 of PMLA is not envisaged for grant of interim bail on medical condition of the wife of the accused/ applicant. It has also been argued that the accused/ applicant is not a flight risk as he is aged around 61 years and has deep roots in society. It has also been argued that during the custody and pendency of investigation, the accused/ applicant had fully cooperated. Further, that the accused/ applicant shall abide by all conditions imposed by the court and is willing to even surrender his passport.

5. It has also been argued that investigation in the present matter qua the accused/ applicant is complete as the prosecution complaint has already been filed before the Court on 16.01.2026. It has been argued that the accused/ applicant be granted interim bail for a period of four weeks.
6. Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused has relied upon the following judgments in support of his arguments.

1. ***Directorate of Enforcement Vs. Manoj Gaur*** CRLN No. 253/2026 dated 06.02.2026 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, wherein it has been held that *"15. Upon a conspectus of the submissions made, and on perusing the documents on record, in particular the response and opinion of the attending doctors in relation to the medical condition of the respondent's mother, the considerations that prevail with this court at this stage are the following:*

- 15.1. The petitioner has challenged the grant of interim bail by the learned sessions court vidé order dated 24.01.2026, which court had granted interim bail to the respondent for a period of 02 weeks, with a peremptory direction to the respondent to surrender before the jail authorities upon completion of that period.*

- 15.2. Since the present petition was filed by the ED challenging the very grant of interim bail, it would have been untenable for the learned sessions court to entertain an application seeking extension of the interim bail, the grant of which was under challenge before this court. Moreover, considering the circumstances with which the respondent is presently faced, this court*

would not dismiss the present application on the ground of maintainability or any other technicality.

15.3. The medical opinion of the attending doctors from an established medical institution in relation to the respondent's mother categorically records, that the mother's medical condition is critical and that she is terminally ill. The doctor's have said that the prognosis is poor; but (obviously) they would not know when death will occur. This is the opinion given writing, not just by one but by two consulting doctors, who are attending on the respondent's mother.

15.4. The respondent has been under investigation in an ECIR dating back to 2018, in which he was arrested only on 13.11.2025 i.e., after the lapse of about 7 years. In light of this fact, it is hard to to give much credence to the ED's apprehension that after nearly 08 years of an ongoing investigation, in which the respondent was not in custody for about 7 years, the respondent is now a palpable threat either in relation to destruction of evidence or intimidation of witnesses.

15.5. The respondent has availed 02 weeks' of interim bail granted vide order dated 24.01.2026 by the learned sessions court, having been released from custody on 24.01.2026; and there is no allegation that during this period, while he has been on interim bail, he has either violated any condition of interim bail or committed any other act that would disentitle him from retaining his liberty for some more time.

15.6. The respondent's mother is admittedly about 89 years of age and time is not on her side, especially considering her precarious state of health.”

2. **Rajesh Kumar vs. Directorate of Enforcement**, Bail application no. 2128/2025, Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, dated 05.02.2026, wherein it has been held that “2. The grounds on which interim bail is sought by the applicant relate_ to the medical condition of his

eight-year-old daughter, who is suffering from Type-1 Diabetes Mellitus, has suffered hypoglycemic seizures and fluctuating blood sugar levels. The applicant has also annexed medical documents of his mother, who is required to undergo cataract surgery on 18.02.2026.

3. As far as the daughter's medical condition is concerned, the applicant has placed on record medical documents from the Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh ["GIMER"], which show that she has been under treatment for Type-1 Diabetes Mellitus since 2023. The medical prescription dated 25.01.2026 records that she suffered a seizure with frothing from the mouth, lasting for five minutes, with upward deviation of the eyes, which was relieved by intravenous medication. The doctor has recorded an impression of a hypoglycemic seizure and advised medication.

4. Pursuant to the order dated 04.02.2026, Mr. Arkaj Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-Directorate of Enforcement, has handed over a status report dated 04.02.2026, which is taken on record. The status report includes a questionnaire addressed to the treating doctor, Endocrinology and Diabetes Unit, Department of Pediatrics, GIMER, wherein the doctor has stated that the child's diabetes is poorly controlled; the hypoglycemic episodes are not life-threatening and are generally manageable at home; the child is presently stable; she has suffered two episodes of loss of consciousness in the last one month; certain further investigations [EEGs and MRI] have been advised by the pediatric neurologist but have not yet been undertaken; and the child requires regular OPD visits, with hospitalisation required only during emergencies.

10. In the present case, the condition of the applicant's daughter, in my view, requires the exercise of such discretion in his favour. The child is merely 8 years of age and suffers from a chronic illness, which has recently manifested in hypoglycemic seizures. Although the treatment is to be administered at home as of now, the treating physician has stated that the child has undergone

two episodes of loss of consciousness in the last one month. Radiological investigations advised by the neurologist have not yet been completed. The management of this situation, in the interest of the child, in my view, requires the presence of her father, i.e. the applicant at least for a short period, to assist in carrying out the investigations and making arrangements for her continued care.

11. I am also informed that the applicant has an elder daughter, aged 13 years. It cannot be expected that the applicant's wife alone will be able to attend to the younger daughter in these circumstances.

12. Although the applicant has also raised the ground of his mother's impending cataract surgery, I note that he has a brother who is a government employee. Having come to the conclusion that the applicant is entitled to a short period of interim bail on the ground of his daughter's treatment, this ground does not require further adjudication.

13. I am also conscious of the fact that he was earlier released on interim bail pursuant to the order of this Court dated 14.11.2024, and Inere is no allegation of his having misused the liberty or of not surrendering on time.”

3. ***Jaspreet Singh Bagga vs. Directorate of Enforcement***, Bail application no. 2470/2025 and CRLMA No. 23289/2025, Hon’ble High Court of Delhi, dated 21.08.2025, wherein it has been held that *“11. The reports so received indicate that the applicant's father is undergoing treatment for prostate-related issues and that investigations including PET Scan and Biopsy had been advised. The verification further records that the applicant's wife has been diagnosed with neurological complications as per MRI reports, and that her treating doctors have suggested further management. It is pointed out that despite the alleged gravity of her medical condition, the wife of the applicant did not get herself*

admitted. This conduct itself shows that there is no imminent threat to her. life and her condition is being managed on an outpatient basis.

12. Likewise, the medical record of the minor son indicates that he had been admitted to Kalra Hospital between 11.05.2025 and 14.05.2025 and had later undergone treatment at RML Hospital. Thus, the veracity of the medical records placed by the applicant stands confirmed.

13. It is, however, the submission of the respondent that mere existence of medical conditions of family members is not sufficient ground to release the applicant on interim bail, especially in light of the gravity of allegations levelled against him under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002.

14. It is further contended that the applicant's regular bail application has already been dismissed on 04.07.2025 and his earlier plea for interim bail was also dismissed by the learned Special Judge on 31.07.2025, observing that none of the family members were hospitalized at that point of time. The respondent stresses that the present application is a repetition on similar grounds, and that the applicant cannot be permitted to seek liberty merely on account of producing verified medical papers.

15. The respondent also submits that there are other adult family members-available to look after the applicant's dependents, and that the claim of the applicant being the only person capable of extending support is not entirely correct. It is urged that appropriate medical treatment is already available to the family members at reputed hospitals, and their treatment does not necessitate the physical presence of the applicant outside custody. It is further submitted that financial arrangements for treatment can be made without the applicant's release, and no exceptional circumstance has been demonstrated which requires grant of interim bail: affecting the applicant's father and wife. However, their treatment is at a stage where diagnostic procedures are required to be undertaken before the final course of action is decided.

27. It is also seen that certain arrangements, both financial and logistical, are essential to ensure that the father and wife of the applicant are admitted, investigated and prepared for subsequent treatment.

28. The claim of the applicant that no other adult family member is available to make such arrangements, cannot be brushed aside entirely in view of the verification reports as well as his explanation regarding estrangement of other relatives.

29. At the same time, this Court cannot lose sight of the fact that the allegations against the applicant under the MLA are grave, his regular bail has already been declined, and interim bail on earlier occasion was rejected by the learned Special Judge.

30. Grant of liberty, therefore, has to be circumscribed by strict conditions and confined only to the limited purpose of facilitating the arrangements required for the medical treatment of applicant's father and wife.

31. At this stage, it is also necessary to observe that there are certain matters which must first be verified and ascertained so as to avoid multiplicity of proceedings and protracted litigation merely on interim bail applications. The schedule of the medical procedures for the applicant's father and wife, the precise nature of investigations advised, and the requirement of subsequent surgical interventions need to be determined.”

4. In ***Lovee Narula vs. Directorate of Enforcement***, Bail application no. 1937/2025, Hon’ble High Court of Delhi dated 09.06.2025, wherein it has been held that “11. The present application is filed for grant of interim bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') and Section 45 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 ('PMLA') for a period of forty five days on humanitarian ground to enable the Applicant to attend to his critically ill mother, Smt. Parvesh Narula and to make necessary arrangements for her

continued medical treatment, including MRI scans, consultations, hospitalisation, surgical intervention, and rehabilitation. was further submitted on behalf of the Respondent that although the Applicant was given a custody parole, he has wilfully failed to avail the said opportunity. It was further submitted that the ground of illness of a family member of the accused is not available under Section 45 of PMLA. It was also submitted that there is a categorical finding by this Court that if the Applicant is enlarged on bail, there is a possibility of evidence tampering and influencing the witnesses.

12. Mr. Amit Chadha, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Applicant has relied upon the medical report placed on record to show that Applicant's mother has suffered a fracture of partial collapse of D-11 and L-1 vertebrae. As per the x-ray reports, there is a specific observation regarding partial vertebral collapse of the lumbar spine, which is critical in nature. It is submitted that further advanced diagnostic such as MRI of the lumbar spine and surgical intervention for spinal stabilisation is required and for that, the presence of the Applicant will be necessary. As regards not visiting the OPD of the hospital after 24.04.2025, the learned counsel for the Applicant has submitted that in absence of any family member with the mother of the Applicant, she was unable to visit the doctor as she is bed ridden.”

5. *Amar Singh Rathore vs. State of Rajasthan*, 2024, SCC Online, RAJ 3270, wherein it has been held “Petitioner has filed the instant petition seeking his interim bail for 3 months on medical grounds of his wife. She requires immediate surgery for spinal listhesis, lateral bone plate issue care for her, and she is unable to undergo the surgery without the support of an attendant or family member. As per the medical record of the wife of the petitioner appended with the petition herein, it is borne out that his wife is getting medical treatment at Jawahar Lal Nehru Hospital, Ajmer,

in the Neuro Surgery Department. As per the medical opinion rendered by Dr. Sushil Acharyan, Professor & Head of Neurosurgery Department, she has been advised surgery for 'Pedicle Screw Fixation'.

9. Petitioner is a person with family ties and is not a flight risk.

Nature of prosecution evidence is mostly all documentary in nature, which has been seized and there is no likelihood of dignity as a human being which necessary entails to act as a good husband in terms of the marital vows taken during the saptapadi ceremony as per Hindu rituals.

11. Resultantly, in view of report and other reasons as above, the writ petition is allowed. The petitioner is directed to be released on temporary bail for a period of 60 days with effect from the date, the bail bonds and surety bonds are accepted by the Superintendent, Central Jail, Jodhpur.”

ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF ED

7. On the other hand, Ld. SPP for ED Sh. Simon Benjamin has vehemently opposed the bail application moved on behalf of accused/ applicant for seeking interim bail. It has been argued that the wife of accused/ applicant is taking her treatment from Indraprastha Apollo Hospital for her ailment since the year 2024 and has been visiting OPD for the said purpose. It has been argued that she has been receiving her medical treatment as per the advice of the doctor and is currently stable and does not require any support of accused/ applicant. It has been argued that the wife of the accused/ applicant has several other adult family members who can provide moral care and support to her in the absence of accused/ applicant. It has been argued that the accused/ applicant has three grown up children who are studying in UAE and can

visit India to provide care and support for the wife of the accused/ applicant and there is no reason as to why they have not been travelling to India. It has been argued that the brother and wife of the brother of the accused are also residing in Delhi and can provide assistance and support to the wife of applicant/ accused and the present application is meritless. It has been argued that the twin conditions of bail as mandated U/s 45 PMLA, 2002 are pari materia to Section 37 of the NDPS Act, 1985 and thus for even grant of interim bail the accused/ applicant is required to satisfy the Court and in the present matter the same is not made out and therefore, the accused/ applicant is not entitled for grant of interim bail. It has been argued that the accused/ applicant does not fall within the exception of the proviso of Section 45(1) of the PMLA and therefore, the application is liable to be dismissed.

8. Ld. Spl PP for ED has also argued that there are no exceptional circumstances for the accused/ applicant to be granted interim bail as there are alternative family support available to wife of accused/ applicant during her treatment.
9. Ld. Spl. PP for ED has also argued that in the present matter there are 3 FIRs (predicate offence) against the accused in which there is money laundering for a huge amount and there is direct involvement of accused/ applicant. He has further argued that apart from the aforesaid offences there is also an FIR under the

UAPA which is pending against the accused/ applicant. During the course of arguments, Ld. SPP for ED has placed on record a copy of an FIR no. 229/2025 PS Dhauj, Faridabad, dated 19.11.2025 in this regard. It has been argued that due to the seriousness of the offences alleged against the accused/ applicant, he is not liable to be granted interim bail and therefore, the aforesaid application is liable to be rejected.

10. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused has vehemently opposed the submissions made on behalf of ED and has stated that the contention raised on behalf of Ld. Spl. PP for ED regarding satisfaction of twin conditions as envisaged U/s 45 of PMLA are concerned, the same are not required as it is application for seeking interim bail and not regular bail. It has been argued that at the time of consideration of interim bail, the merits pertaining to the allegations against the accused are not required to be looked into. It has also been argued that during the investigation in the FIRs (predicate offence) or in the present matter the accused/ applicant has always cooperated and had joined investigation. It has also been argued that the ground of opposition of bail regarding availability of relatives are frivolous since the wife of the accused/ applicant is currently residing alone and does not have any care or support and moreso in her medical condition it is required for her to have the company of her husband i.e. the accused/ applicant.

11. On the other hand, it has also been argued on behalf of Ld. Spl. PP for ED that the accused/ applicant has substantial financial capacity and shall influence the investigation. It has also been argued that there are more aspects of investigation which are still pending and the accused/ applicant may tamper with witnesses and influence stake holders connected with the case and therefore, the application for seeking interim bail be rejected.

12. Ld. Spl. PP for ED has relied upon following judgments in support of his arguments:

1. ***State of Maharashtra vs. Vinod Sabaji Loke***, 1995 SCC Online, Bom. 388, wherein it was held that “*For the reasons stated above, criminal application No.3047 of 1995 succeeds and is allowed. The orders of the learned Special Judge dated April 19, 1995 and November 29, 1995 are set aside.*”

2. ***Union of India vs. Kanhaiya Prasad***, 2025, SCC Online, SC 306, wherein it was held that “*As well settled, the offence of money laundering is not an ordinary offence. The PMLA has been enacted to deal with the subject of money laundering activities having transnational impact on financial systems including sovereignty and integrity of the countries. The offence of money laundering has been regarded as an aggravated form of crime world over and the offenders involved in the activity connected with the Proceeds of Crime are treated as a separate class from*

ordinary criminals. Any casual or cursory approach by the Courts while considering the bail application of the offender involved in the offence of money laundering and granting him bail by passing cryptic orders without considering the seriousness of the crime and without considering the rigours of Section 45, cannot be vindicated.”

3. **Tarun Kumar vs. Enforcement Directorate**, 2023 SCC Online SC 1486, wherein it was held that “As well settled by now, the conditions specified under Section 45 are mandatory. They need to be complied with. The Court is required to be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such offence and he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. It is needless to say that as per the statutory presumption permitted under Section 24 of the Act, the Court or the Authority is entitled to presume unless the contrary is proved, that in any proceedings relating to proceeds of crime under the Act, in the case of a person charged with the offence of money laundering under Section 3, such proceeds of crime are involved in money laundering. Such conditions enumerated in Section 45 of PML Act will have to be complied with even in respect of an application for bail made under Section 439 Cr. P.C. in view of the overriding effect given to the PML Act over the other law for the time being in force, under Section 71 of the PML Act.”

4. **Y. S. Jaganmohan Reddy vs. CBI**, 2013 7 SCC 439, wherein it was held that “ *Economic offences constitute a class apart and*

need to be visited with a different approach in the matter of bail. The economic offences having deep-rooted conspiracies and involving huge loss of public funds need to be viewed seriously and considered as grave offences affecting the economy of the country as a whole and thereby posing serious threat to the financial health of the country. While granting bail, the court has to keep in mind the nature of accusations, the nature of evidence in support thereof, the severity of the punishment which conviction will entail, the character of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused, reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, the larger interests of the public/State and other similar considerations.

5. Bhupender Singh Gurjar vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, MIS CrI No. 716/2026 “Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the applicant is facing trial for grave and serious offences, including the offence punishable under Section 302 of the IPC. The applicant has already filed two earlier bail applications and the present application is the third one, confined only to the prayer for temporary bail. From the medical documents placed on record, it is evident that the condition of the applicant's wife is stable and improving, and she was likely to be discharged shortly though the counsel for the applicant refutes and as the medical papers do not

disclose any emergent or life-threatening condition requiring the presence of the applicant at this stage, mere illness of a family member, particularly when the condition is under control and improving, does not constitute an exceptional circumstance warranting grant of temporary/interim bail in a case involving heinous offences. In view of the seriousness of the allegations, the nature of the offence, the period of custody, and the medical status reflected in the verified documents, this Court does not find any justifiable ground to exercise discretion in favour of the applicant.”

13. I have heard the arguments advanced by Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused, Ld. Spl. PP for ED and have carefully perused the record.

14. *Briefly*, the ECIR in the present matter was registered on 14.11.2025 upon the predicate offence committed in FIR no. 337/2025, 338/2025 and 21/2026 PS Jamia Nagar. Subsequently, accused/ applicant was arrested in the present matter on 18.11.2025. After completion of investigation, ECIR in present matter has been filed on 16.01.2026 and the matter is listed for arguments on point of cognizance on 27.03.2026.

15. In the present matter, applicant/ accused is facing allegations for the offence u/sec. 3/4 of PMLA. Applicant/ accused has annexed

with the application the medical treatment paper/ discharge papers of his wife from Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi, dated June, 2024, 28.10.2025, 19.02.2026, 26.02.2026. Applicant accused has also placed on record the documents pertaining to the board examination of his son who is studying in UAE and has exams scheduled for 09.03.2026, 12.03.2026 and 25.03.2026. Further, document pertaining to the education being pursued by the daughter of accused/ applicant from Sharja, UAE. The medical documents pertaining to the wife of accused/ applicant are not disputed by Ld. Spl. PP for ED. The medical documents annexed with the application suggest that the wife of the accused/ applicant is suffering from cancer and is undergoing chemotherapy at the aforesaid hospital, and is taking treatment as advised. Further, the ailments and medical condition of the wife of accused/applicant is not disputed by the counsel for ED.

16. The objection raised on behalf of Ld. Spl. PP for ED, primarily are regarding the fact, that the condition of the wife of the applicant is stable and she is in a condition to take help from her relatives for aforesaid treatment and further that the children of the applicant who are studying in Dubai/UAE can visit India for giving support and care to the wife of the accused. The other contention raised on behalf of the Ld. Spl. PP for ED is pertaining to the seriousness of the offence and also that the accused has involvement in several

other matters and that he may tamper with evidence and influence witnesses, if granted bail.

17. The aforesaid contentions on behalf of ED has been vehemently opposed by Ld. Counsel for applicant/ accused and the submissions on behalf of both parties have been taken into consideration. As far as the contention raised on behalf of ED is concerned regarding the condition of wife of accused, it cannot be lost sight that she is suffering from serious ailment i.e. cancer and for which she is undergoing treatment and chemotherapy. The treatment paper suggest that she is required to visit the hospital for the relevant time. Also, the fact that she does not have anyone in her house to take care of her is also not disputed.

18. It is also to be taken into consideration that all 3 children of accused/ applicant are currently residing in UAE and pursuing their studies and the youngest child of accused/ applicant is pursuing class XIIth and is having Class XIIth board examination. Due to the prevailing condition of War, it cannot be expected from the children of accused/ applicant to visit India for the chemotherapy of the wife of the accused/ applicant scheduled for 12.03.2026. Further, the objection raised on behalf of ED regarding the offence in question, the prosecution complaint (PC) has already been filed and the matter is listed for arguments on point of cognizance.

19. Moreso, the wife of accused/ applicant requires care and support, cannot be ignored and it is also a fact that she does not have her family or children besides her and it is only the accused/ applicant being her husband who is required to give her support. Interim bail on medical grounds, is a legal concept that allows a prisoner to be released from jail on medical grounds of his family members particularly in the case of his wife. After considering all the present facts and circumstances, I am of the considered view that applicant/ accused deserves to be enlarged on interim bail as the wife of applicant/ accused is unwell. Also, the prosecution complaint has been filed and it is not disputed that the accused/ applicant had joined investigation and had not tried to flee away from justice. Further, apprehension raised by prosecution, can be taken care of by imposing necessary conditions.

20. Accordingly, in view of the above, applicant/ accused Jawad Ahmad Siddiqui, is granted interim bail for the period of two weeks from the date of his release, subject to furnishing personal bond and surety bond in the sum of Rs. 1 Lakh each.

Further, this order entails following conditions :-

- a) Application shall not leave Delhi / NCR without permission of this Court.
- b) Applicant shall keep his mobile phone in switch on mode, all the time by furnishing its details to the IO concerned, in writing within three days from now.
- c) In case, he changes his mobile number, then he will inform IO concerned in writing, within one day of said change.

- d) Applicant shall not try to meet complainant and/or his family members till the adjudication of this case.
- e) Applicant shall not threaten complainant/ witnesses physically or verbally through any electronic mode.
- f) That accused will not commit any crime/offence or anti-social activity during the aforesaid period.
- g) **That the accused/applicant shall surrender his passport to the investigating officer.**
- h) The accused/ applicant shall provide his residential address to the IO and shall reside at the same address throughout the period of his release and shall not change his place of stay without intimation to the IO.
- i) **At the time of the release, the Jail Superintendent will inform the applicant in writing of the date and time, within which he must surrender.**

Copy of this order be sent to Superintendent, Tihar Jail, concerned, for information and compliance.

Application stands disposed off, accordingly.

Order Dasti.

Sheetal
chaudhary

Digitally
signed by
Sheetal
chaudhary
Date:
2026.03.07
16:50:11
+0530

[Sheetal Chaudhary Pradhan]
ASJ-02, South-East/Saket/Delhi
07.03.2026(m)