



IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE, AMBEDKAR NAGAR

CNR NO: UPAN010032672026

BAIL APPLICATION NO. 767 OF 2026

Chandrapal Singh alias C.P. Singh, aged about 44 years,

S/o Sureshpal Singh,

R/o Mithilapuri Phase-02, Veer Savarkar Chauraha, Police Station Izzatnagar, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh. ... **Applicant / Accused**

Versus

The State of Uttar Pradesh through Public Prosecutor. ... **Prosecution**

The present first regular bail application has been moved on behalf of the applicant/accused, **Chandrapal Singh alias C.P. Singh**, under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 [corresponding to Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023], seeking regular bail in connection with **Case Crime No. 86/2024**, registered under Sections **419, 420, 34, 467, 468, 471, 506, and 504 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC)** at **Police Station Bhati, District Ambedkar Nagar**. The application is supported by an affidavit sworn by the applicant's parokar, Karan Singh.

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant/accused, the learned District Government Counsel (Criminal) for the State, and perused the entire judicial record.

POINTS FOR DETERMINATION

1. Whether the applicant, by allegedly impersonating a high-ranking police officer (Inspector General of Police) and floating a fraudulent employment racket, has committed an offence of extreme socio-economic gravity.
2. Whether the applicant can claim parity with co-accused persons who have been granted bail, given his distinct role in executing the fraud and manufacturing forged documents.
3. Whether the presence of a prolific criminal history consisting of **10 cases of an identical nature** disentitles the applicant to the exercise of discretionary bail under the law.

FINDINGS

On Point No. 1: Gravity of Offence and Modus Operandi

The prosecution case reveals a deeply disturbing and calculated operation chain. The informant, Smt. Bindu, was desperately seeking employment for her only son, Ajay Kumar. Taking advantage of this, the applicant introduced himself as an active **Inspector General of Police (IG)** and promised to secure a constable's post for her son. On his direct inducements, a total sum exceeding **Rs. 23,59,900/-** was extracted via multiple bank accounts (including the accounts of co-accused Pushpa Anil and the applicant's brother, Ved Prakash) and via direct cash transactions.

The offence assumes a devastating colour as the applicant personally delivered a meticulously forged and fabricated "Police Department Joining Letter" to the victim. When the letter was verified as a blatant forgery, the young victim suffered a fatal shock and passed away on June 11, 2022. When confronted, the applicant weaponised his position to issue death threats and caste-based abuses.

The defence's contention that the case is magistrate-triable or lacks specific dates cannot minimise the sheer gravity of structured financial deception. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in [*Prahlad Singh Bhati vs N.C.T., Delhi & Anr on 23 March, 2001: Appeal \(crl.\) 324 of 2001*](#), held that the jurisdiction to grant bail has to be exercised on the basis of well-settled principles having regard to the circumstances of each case and not in an arbitrary manner. While granting the 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, behaviour, means and standing 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 or State and similar other considerations. It has also to be kept in mind that for the purposes of granting the bail the Legislature has used the words "reasonable grounds for believing" instead of "the evidence" which means the court dealing with the grant of bail can only satisfy it as to whether there is a genuine case against the accused and that the prosecution will be able to produce prima facie evidence in support of the charge. It is not expected, at this stage, to have the evidence establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt.

The jurisdiction to grant bail must be guided by the nature of the accusation, the severity of the punishment, and the systemic shock the

offence deals to society. Deceiving unemployed youth by fabricating public employment letters strikes at the root of societal trust.

On Point No. 2: Rejection of the Plea of Parity

The learned counsel for the applicant argued that co-accused Pushpa Anil and Anil Kumar have already been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court, and hence the applicant deserves release on the grounds of parity.

This Court finds the argument completely untenable. The principal role of active misrepresentation—impersonating an IG of Police and delivering the forged joining letters—is attributed explicitly to the present applicant. Parity cannot be claimed blindly when the roles are entirely asymmetric. The applicant is the kingpin of the operation, whereas the co-accused played subsidiary/facilitatory roles.

On Point No. 3: Criminal History as an Absolute Bar

While the applicant claimed in his application to have no criminal history, the prosecution has brought on record an alarming and definitive history of **12 criminal cases of an identical nature, except 2 cases** pending against him across various jurisdictions. All these cases involve matching patterns of cheating, forgery of government documents, and job scams.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in [*Neeru Yadav vs State of U.P. & Anr on 29 September, 2015: AIR 2015 SUPREME COURT 3703*](#) held:

"We will be failing in our duty if we do not take note of the concept of liberty and its curtailment by law. It is an established fact that a crime, though committed against an individual, in all cases it does not retain an individual character. It, on occasions and in certain offences, accentuates and causes harm to society. The victim may be an individual, but in the ultimate event, it is society which is the victim. A crime, as is understood, creates a dent in the law and order situation. In a civilised society, a crime disturbs orderliness. It affects the peaceful life of the society. An individual can enjoy his liberty, which is definitely of paramount value, but he cannot be a law unto himself. He cannot cause harm to others. He cannot be a nuisance to the collective. He cannot be a terror to society."

The existence of 10 prior cases of the same nature unequivocally demonstrates that the applicant is a habitual, career offender specialising in economic crimes and recruitment scams. If released on bail, there is an absolute certainty of his tampering with prosecution witnesses, destroying evidence, and committing similar offences.

ORDER

For the reasons explicitly detailed under the findings above, this Court is of the firm view that the applicant does not fulfil the criteria for the grant of discretionary bail.

1. Regular Bail Application No. 767/2026 filed on behalf of the applicant, **Chandrapal Singh alias C.P. Singh**, in connection with Case Crime No. 86/2024, under Sections 419, 420, 34, 467, 468, 471, 506, and 504 IPC, Police Station Bhati, District Ambedkar Nagar, is hereby **REJECTED**.
2. Let a copy of this order be forwarded to the concerned Trial Court and the Superintendent of the concerned Jail for information.

(Chandroday Kumar)

Sessions Judge

Ambedkar Nagar,

Judicial Officer Code: UP6553

08.06.2026