

ITEM NO.53

COURT NO.17

SECTION II-B

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

PETITION(S) FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL (CRL.) NO(S). 12846/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 07-07-2026 in CRM-M No. 34651/2026 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

SANJEEV ARORA

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT & ANR.

RESPONDENT(S)

(IA No. 203404/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 203420/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 204224/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 203426/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Date : 28-07-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Puneet Bali, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Aditya Soni, AOR
Mr. Arjun Dewan, Adv.
Mr. Rajat, Adv.
Mr. Khan Ahmad Darvesh, Adv.
Mr. Aryan Deol, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Suryaprakash V. Raju, Ld. ASG
Mr. Zoheb Hussain, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Annam Venkatesh, Adv.
Ms. Sairica Raju, Adv.
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, Adv.

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

1. The present special leave petition has been filed by the petitioner for grant of bail on medical grounds.

2. Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has stated before this Court that the regular bail application was preferred under Section 483 of the *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023* read with Section 45 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 before the Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge (PMLA), Gurugram, Haryana and the same was dismissed by order dated 15.06.2026.

3. The petitioner thereafter being aggrieved by order dated 15.06.2026, preferred a petition for grant of regular bail before the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and the same was registered as CRM-M-34651/2026 (O & M). Notices were issued in the matter on 07.07.2026 and High Court directed the matter to be listed on 05.08.2026.

4. It has been further stated than an application was also preferred for grant of interim bail and a request was made to the High Court to hear the application, however, the mentioning was declined. There is no order on record that the mentioning was declined in the matter.

5. The petitioner thereafter preferred a special leave petition before this Court for grant of bail. It was submitted before this Court that the High Court was not hearing the matter. In those circumstances, by order dated 20.07.2026, and keeping in view the statement made by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is unwell, Mr. Suryaprakash V. Raju, learned

Additional Solicitor General, was requested to obtain a medical report from the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as "AIIMS").

6. The matter was listed on 24.07.2026. The petitioner was subjected to medical examination and a medical report has also been filed in the matter and the conclusion of the Medical Board which is comprising of six senior doctors reads as under:

"Conclusion

In view of the clinical assessment and the available medical records, the Medical Board is of the opinion that the petitioner is clinically stable at present. He has been advised to continue medical management, including medications and patient is advised for angiography for further evaluation"

7. The aforesaid observations of the Medical Board make it clear that the petitioner is clinically stable at present. However, in the medical report it has been advised the continuation of medical management, including medications, and has further advised for angiography for further evaluation.

8. Mr. S.V. Raju, learned Additional Solicitor General, on instructions was fair enough in stating before this Court that the State will take all possible steps for getting the angiography done as and when need so arises and he has further stated that the State shall be taking all possible care of the petitioner by referring the petitioner

to AIIMS which is one of the most premium institution of this country. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail as the matter is already listed before Punjab and Haryana High Court and a date has also been fixed, i.e., 05.08.2026.

9. Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the judgment(s)/order(s) decided in *Amar Sadharam Mulchandani v. Directorate of Enforcement & Anr.* (SLP (Crl.) No.11376 of 2024); *Satyendra Kumar Jain v. Directorate of Enforcement, 2023 SCC OnLine SC 686*; *P. Sarath Chandra Reddy v. Directorate of Enforcement (Bail Application No.1266 of 2023, decided by the High Court of Delhi)*; *Sameer Mahandru v. Directorate of Enforcement (Bail Application No.1343 of 2023, decided by the High Court of Delhi)*; *Directorate of Enforcement v. Sameer Mahandru* (SLP (Crl.) No.7438 of 2023); *Dheeraj Wadhawan v. Central Bureau of Investigation & Anr.* (Bail Application No.2471 of 2023 and I.A. No.1368 of 2023, decided by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay); and *Central Bureau of Investigation v. Dheeraj Wadhawan & Anr.* (SLP (Crl.) Nos.17428-17429 of 2024).

10. On the other hand, Mr. Suryaprakash V. Raju, learned Additional Solicitor General has placed reliance upon the order passed by this Court in Criminal Appeal No.4908 of 2024 arising from SLP (Criminal) No.9395/2024, State of

Chhattisgarh vs. Anwar Dhebar.

11. This Court has carefully gone through the aforesaid judgment(s)/order(s). However, as the bail petition of the petitioner herein is already listed on 05.08.2026 before the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh, and as learned Additional Solicitor General on instructions has given a categorical undertaking before this Court to ensure best possible treatment to the petitioner even for an Angiography in case need so arises in future, this Court is of the opinion that the present special leave petition deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed. However, it is made clear that the Jail Authority shall provide all possible treatment in case of any medical emergency as and when required keeping in view the Medical Report of the petitioner.

12. This Court has not expressed any opinion on merits and the High Court of Punjab and Haryana shall be free to decide the matter on merits after hearing the parties at length in accordance with law

13. With the aforesaid, the Special Leave Petition stands dismissed.

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

(RAHUL KUMAR)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(KOMAL)
COURT MASTER (NSH)