IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

A.B.A. No. 1609 of 2026

Dr. Ashok Kumar Singh, son of Late Jhuri Singh
… … Petitioner

-Versus-

The Central Bureau of Investigation through the Superintendent of Police, Dhanbad **… Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rupesh Singh, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Prashant Pallav, ASGI

Arguments concluded on 11.06.2026 **Pronounced on 12.06.2026**

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with CBI/SPE/ACB Dhanbad FIR No. RC 4(A)/2023D, registered for the offences under Sections 120-B read with 420 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(a) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (as amended in 2018), pending in the court of learned ADJ-III-cum-Special Judge, CBI, Dhanbad.

Arguments of the Petitioner

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was posted as Chief Scientist during the period from 2017 to 2025 (till retirement) and Head of Research Group CSIR- CIMFR *[Council of Scientific and Industrial Research - Central Institute of Mining and Fuel Research]* during the period from 2015 to 2023. He also submits that during his tenure, CIMFR, Dhanbad was awarded the prestigious CSIR Technology award for the years 2017 and 2019.

3. The learned counsel submits that the present criminal case was instituted against the petitioner and one co-accused Sri P.K. Singh, the Director of CSIR- CIMFR, alleging irregularities in distribution of Honorarium/intellectual fee/Project fee arising out of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) effective from 1st January 2016 and 304 agreements executed thereunder. He submits that there has been no irregularity or illegality and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case.

4. The learned counsel submits that the ***CSIR Guidelines for Technology Transfer and Utilization of Knowledgebase-2017 (hereinafter referred to as "the guidelines")*** deals with Distribution of Honorarium from licensing of Intellectual Property and Knowledgebase Consultancy and Fee from sponsored research projects/schemes as well as the Contract Research and Development Projects and Scientific and Technology Projects. He refers to Chapters-7 and 8 of the guidelines, which deals with pattern of sharing of money with staff.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner draws the attention of the Court towards Page-292 of the petition, which is the MoU and submits that the effective date, duration and termination of the MoU is governed by S.8.1, which shall be valid w.e.f. 1st January, 2016 or the date of signing of MoU as the case may be and shall remain in force for the period of ten years with a provision to extend for another five years.

6. The learned counsel has submitted that as per S.2.2, it was agreed amongst the parties to enter into separate independent agreement on the terms and conditions mentioned in the MOU.

S.4.3 is the Schedule Period: The MOU will be valid for 10 years and may be extended for another 5 years on mutual consent.

S.5.3: The MOU will be effective from 1st January 2016/date of signing of the MOU.

7. The learned counsel referred to the Management Council Arrangement which is Clause 65 of Memorandum of Association Rules and Regulations and Bye-Laws and he submits that manner of formation of the management council has been prescribed therein and, in the council, apart from the Director, there are other members mentioned and the Director is to function as Chairman. The other members are four scientists of the laboratory representing the staff of the various age groups; one representative of technical personnel; one Director level scientist from the same laboratory or sister laboratory; Head, Research Planning Business Development/Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of the National Laboratory; Controller of

Finance and Accounts/F&AO of the Lab; controller of Administration/ Administrative Officer of the Laboratory as Member Secretary and the members are to be nominated by the Director General, CSIR for a period of 2 years. The learned counsel has submitted that only the director and the petitioner have been selectively made accused and the other members of the council are not accused in this case.

8. The learned counsel has referred to CSIR Guidelines for Technology Transfer and Utilization of Knowledgebase-2017 which was made effective from 01.09.2017 and has referred to Clause 7.1 which deals with the Contract R & D and Technical Services and provides that the distributable share to the staff is 25% of the project cost excluding capital cost for the projects taken up on or after 01.09.2017.

9. He has further referred to Clause 7.4 dealing with patten of distribution and by referring to sub-clause (iv), has submitted that the distribution pattern of 'Investigators' share of money realized from contract R & D, Consultancy, Licensing of Intellectual Property, Licensing of knowledgebase and Technical Services for the project taken up after 01.09.2017 would go to the extent of 65% to the Innovators and Principal Contributors/team of Consultants and thus it is submitted that 65% of 25% of the project cost would go to Innovators and Principal Contributors/Team of Consultants.

10. Clause 7.4 (iv) is quoted as under:

"The distribution pattern of 'Investigators' share of monies realized from Contract R & D, Consultancy, Licensing of Intellectual Property, Licensing of Knowledgebase and Technical services for project taken up on and after 1st September 2017 is to be as follows:

S. No.	*Staff*	*Share*
i.	*Innovators & Principal Contributors/Team of consultants*	*65%*
ii.	*Directly associated S & T Staff*	*20%*
iii.	*Administrative Staff (Purchase, Stores, Administration, Finance, ESD, Engineering, Utilities, Instrumentation etc.)*	*10%*

iv.	*CSIR Welfare Fund (maintained at Hqrs)*	*5%*

11. He has then referred to Chapter 8 dealing with procedure for sharing of money with staff and has referred to Clause 8.1.1 (f) which provides that in the event of any legal action/dispute necessitating refund/payment of monies/fees by CSIR to the client, the amount paid to the staff is recoverable.

12. The learned counsel further submits that Clause 8.1.4 (s) provides that from 1st of June 2005, there is no ceiling on the amount of honorarium receivable by an individual from licensing of intellectual property and knowledgebase as well as contract R & D and technical services.

13. The learned counsel has then referred to Annexure – 10 at page 291 to submit that the details of external cash flow from 2005-2006 to 2020-2021 has been provided and during the covid period of 2019-2020, there was huge external cash flow.

14. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the MOU, agreement was required to be entered into. The period of validity of the MOU was for 10 years and was extendable upto 5 years on mutual consent, but no specific period with respect to the agreement to be entered was mentioned and accordingly there was no illegality in entering into 304 agreements for shorter period.

15. The learned counsel has further submitted that as per the allegation, 304 coal sampling projects were created by CISR – CIMFR by combining several agreements into one project and further several projects were created from one specific agreement by curtailing its tenure from 10 years and specifying the quantity of coal to be sampled for the project to facilitate distribution of intellectual fees. He submits that mere creation of agreement was not in violation of the MOU and therefore, there was no illegality in receipt of intellectual fee.

16. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the intellectual fee which has been received by the petitioner is under recovery and more than 50% has already been recovered. He also submits that the recovery itself is under challenge in a proceeding before Central Administrative Tribunal.

17. The learned counsel has also submitted that so far as further allegation regarding distribution of money to respective categories of Innovators and Principal Contributors as well as staff is concerned, the same was also in accordance with law. Merely because librarian and MBBS doctors were paid the amount, the same was not in any way in violation of the MOU or any provision of law. The learned counsel has also submitted that in CSIR, there are three categories of employees- technical, scientific and administrative and they have their share as per the project cost in terms of CSIR Guidelines 2005 and 2017 and the money is disbursed on the basis of collective decision of the management council. However, only two persons have been made accused in the present case namely, the petitioner and Dr. Pradeep Kumar Singh, the Director, CSIR.

18. The learned counsel has also referred to Annexure-12, which is an order dated 16.09.2023 passed in R.C. Case No.4 (A)/2003 (D) and MCA No.2612 of 2023 and has submitted that the frozen bank account of the petitioner and his wife, daughter and son were directed to be released vide order dated 16.09.2023 by the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-III, Dhanbad and has submitted that the opposite party CBI has been arbitrarily active against the petitioner and his family members.

19. He has also submitted that there has been no violation of any norms and the money has been paid to the petitioner as per the guidelines with full transparency after deducting the tax deducted at source.

20. He has also referred to the order passed by this Court in W.P.(S) No.5807 of 2022 whereby the order dated 15.11.2022 relating to interim relief passed by Central Administrative Tribunal, Patna Bench, Circuit Bench, Ranchi in OA No.051/00612/2022 was under challenge. The petitioner by filing miscellaneous application, sought interim relief with respect to execution of notice dated 05.08.2022 issued by CSIR-CIMFR, directing the petitioner to refund the gross amount of honorarium paid in the month of March 2021, latest by 20th August 2022, failing which recovery would be effected from his salary.

21. The learned counsel submits that the writ petition was disposed of as the main issue was pending before the Central Administrative Tribunal and it was considered not to touch upon the matter at that stage. The learned counsel submits that the case is still pending before the learned tribunal. However, as stated above, the amount involved in the present case is being recovered from the account of the petitioner and 50% has already been recovered.

22. The learned counsel at the end has referred to the order passed in ***ABA No. 2545 of 2025 dated 19.11.2025*** in the case of co-accused namely, Dr. Pradeep Kumar Singh, who was the Director of CSIR-CIMFR, by which anticipatory bail has been granted to the co-accused. The learned counsel submits that the petitioner stands on similar footing as that of Dr. Pradeep Kumar Singh. The petitioner has also retired and there is no chance of the petitioner to abscond or tamper with any evidence.

23. During the course of hearing, it transpired that Dr. Pradeep Kumar Singh, as recorded in the anticipatory bail order itself, had already deposited the amount of Rs.1,07,52,229.00. The gross amount paid to Dr. Pradeep Kumar Singh was Rs.2,16,11,000.00, in which TDS was also deducted to the extent of Rs.1,08,58,771/- and the balance amount was Rs.1,07,52,229/-.

24. The learned counsel has also relied upon the judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***(2020) 5 SCC 1, Sushila Agarwal vs. State*** and has referred to paragraphs 57, 67, 77.4 and 91. The learned counsel has also submitted that if the anticipatory bail is granted and the petitioner violates any of the terms and conditions, then CBI can always invoke Section 439(2) of Cr.P.C. to arrest the petitioner and take him into custody.

<u>Arguments of the Opposite Party-CBI</u>

25. The learned counsel for the CBI has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is more serious than the allegation against Dr. Pradeep Kumar Singh. He has submitted that the petitioner, being the Head of Research Group, himself received an amount of Rs.9,04,31,337/- as intellectual fee/honorarium. The learned counsel has also submitted that, apart from the aforesaid, the petitioner, with ulterior motive of facilitating illegal distribution of project fee/intellectual fee/honorarium amongst officials of CSIR - CIMFR, distributed an amount of Rs.1,39,79,97,871/- to various officials in violation of the prescribed guidelines, causing wrongful loss to the institution and corresponding wrongful gain to the other accused persons.

26. The learned counsel submits that the amount was distributed to several ineligible persons, including librarian, MBBS doctors, drivers, and others non-technical staff, who had no role whatsoever in the execution of the project. He has also submitted that the statement recorded during investigation clearly indicates that many such beneficiaries have admitted to have made no contribution to the project and have expressed willingness to refund the amount received.

27. The learned counsel has referred to the case diary and submitted that the names of different persons have come in the case diary to whom payment was made, but during the course of recording the statement, the petitioner could not justify as to how such persons including MBBS doctors, have been paid without performing any project-related work, and the petitioner has simply stated that the petitioner was junior in hierarchy and he had simply followed the advice of the Director, the co-accused Dr. P.K. Singh.

28. It was specifically stated by the petitioner that the remaining officers/officials of CIMFR, whose names have been incorporated in the revised project proposal as well as distribution list of honorariums, their names and amount of honorarium have been given as per the advice of the Director (Dr. P.K. Singh). He also stated that the documentary evidence about the specific intellectual work performed by them in the project was not available in the project file which could not be maintained on account of heavy workload in TPS Mega Projects.

29. The learned counsel has submitted that the petitioner has given statements that various other payments were also made to numerous persons as per the advice of Dr. P.K. Singh, but there was no documentary evidence available in the project file for their specific intellectual work performed in the project.

30. The learned counsel submits that the payments were disbursed by the petitioner and during recording of his statement, he has stated that the entire amount was disbursed under the instruction of co-accused, Mr. P.K. Singh, though the disbursal was made by the petitioner.

31. The learned counsel therefore submits that the case of the petitioner is different from the case of Dr. P.K. Singh and the allegation against the petitioner are more serious than Dr. Pradeep Kumar Singh, who was the Director and the petitioner was at the helm of the affair disbursing money to persons who are not connected with the project and had no contribution to the project.

Findings of this Court

32. ***After hearing the learned counsel for the parties,*** this Court finds that it was alleged in the FIR that the petitioner, who was Chief Scientist/Head of Research Group, Resource Quality Assessment Division, CSIR-CIMFR, in association with other persons, dishonestly carried out the distribution of project fee/intellectual fee/honorarium between 2016 and 2021 by violating the laid down norms prescribed in CSIR Guidelines for technology transfer and utilization of knowledgebase 2005 and 2017 causing wrongful loss of Rs.1,39,79,97,871/- and corresponding wrongful gains to others.

33. It was alleged that 4 MOUs for third party sampling of coal was executed and signed on 28.06.2016 and CSIR-CIMFR was represented through the co-accused Dr. P.K. Singh, the Director. As per the MOU, agreements were to be executed and the tenure of the said agreement was for 10 years, which was extendable for another 5 years on mutual consent basis.

34. It was alleged that the agreement specifically mentioned the quantity of coal to be sampled on yearly basis and did not stipulate any sub-division of the said agreement into various projects for shorter period.

35. It was also alleged that 304 coal sampling projects were created by CSIR-CIMFR by combining several agreements into one project and further several projects were created from one specific agreement by curtailing its tenure from 10 years and specifying quantity of coal to be sampled in the project to facilitate the distribution of intellectual fee.

36. It was alleged that the petitioner and Dr. P.K. Singh conspired with other persons with intention to share the intellectual fee by violating paragraph 8.1.1 of CSIR guidelines and consequently caused aforesaid wrongful loss of Rs.1,39,79,97,871/- by paying honorarium, intellectual fee, project fee in violation of paragraph 8.1.3 and 8.1.1 of CSIR Guidelines and technology transfer and utilization of knowledgebase 2005 and 2017.

37. It has been alleged that in this process, Dr. P.K. Singh received intellectual fee of Rs.15,36,72,000/- and the petitioner received Rs.9,04,31,337/-, all through 304 coal sampling projects and remaining amount was shared by other scientists, technical officers, administrative officers and other staff as per the sweet will of the officials and other unknown.

38. With respect to the petitioner, there is additional allegation in the FIR that as per CSIR Guidelines, Paragraph 8.1.3, project records were required to be maintained by the petitioner and other officials and was to be ensured by Dr. P.K. Singh, the then Director, CSIR-CIMFR. However, the same was not done. It has been specifically alleged that it was the petitioner being the Chief Scientist and the project leader who distributed intellectual fee in several projects out of 304 TPS projects and also recommended distribution of intellectual fee which was initiated by other project leaders and the money was arbitrarily distributed amongst various staffs etc. without taking into consideration the manpower and inputs in violation of Paragraph 1.4.2 (ii) of CSIR Guidelines 2005. It has been alleged that money was paid to ineligible officials like librarian, MBBS doctors, technical officers without their contribution in the respective category of innovators and principal contributors as well as S & T staff in violation of Paragraph 8.1.2 of CSIR Guideline. Further, the honorarium was distributed within thirty days from the date of approval by the management council in violation of Paragraph 8.1.4.0 of CSIR Guidelines.

39. The Clause 8, 8.1, 8.1.1., 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.1.4 and 8.2 to 8.2.5 are quoted as under:

> *"8. PROCEDURE FOR SHARING OF MONIES WITH STAFF*
>
> *8.1 Sharing of monies realized from Licensing of Intellectual Property and Knowledgebase as well as Contract R&D and Technical Services etc.*
>
> *8.1.1 Conditions for sharing of monies*
>
> *The sharing of portion of monies as specified in Chapter 7 is subject to fulfillment and compliance of the following:*
>
> *a) A formal cost accounting has been put in place and notified by the laboratory;*
>
> *b) A legally valid agreement has been executed for Intellectual Property licensing/Contract R&D/licensing of technology etc:*
>
> *c) The laboratory has fulfilled its obligations in the assignment in accordance with the terms of the agreement;*
>
> *d) All the monies/fees due have been received in full;*
>
> *e) The client has not contested CSIR's fulfillment of its obligations as defined in the contract/ agreement;*
>
> *f) In the event of any legal action/dispute necessitating refund/ payment of monies/ fees by CSIR to the client, the amount paid to the staff is recoverable;*
>
> *g) Sharing of monies is not permitted in the projects that are not wholly funded (direct and indirect cost + GST) by the client. Partially funded projects are not eligible for sharing of monies; and*
>
> *h) Sharing of monies from projects that have been foreclosed or where there is short receipt of funds or where dues are not recovered fully is not permitted.*
>
> *8.1.2 Categorization of Staff*
>
> *a) 'Innovators and Principal Contributors' may comprise scientists and other S&T staff who provide innovative, developmental, design engineering, experimental, data/ information, testing/ analytical, repair/fabrication, training and business development / marketing inputs for the project/ activity;*
>
> *b) Directly associated S&T Staff may comprise of the staff who provide direct inputs for the specific project/activity. In case of licensing of knowledgebase 'Directly associated S&T Staff may also include amongst the Regular Scientists and Technical Staff, the Project Assistant, Research Associates and Project Scientist who directly contributed to the specific*

knowledgebase development. In case there is no staff under 'Directly associated S&T Staff category, the share of honorarium earmarked for this category shall then go to Laboratory Reserve Fund (LRF);

c) Administrative Staff may comprise laboratory staff from the sections of purchase, stores, administration, finance, ESD, engineering, utilities, instrumentation etc.; and

d) Any change in the approved group of 'Innovators and Principal Contributors' and 'Directly associated S&T Staff' can be made by the Director, with the revision being ratified by the Management Council or DG, CSIR for projects within their competence for approval.

8.1.3 Maintenance of Project Records

The Head of the laboratory shall ensure that the following records are maintained and kept securely in the laboratory:

(i) By Project Leader

a) Project File

Document containing information on a systematic basis on initiation of the idea; date of starting of the project; list of 'Innovators and Principal Contributors' and 'Directly associated S&T Staff' (as defined earlier); responsibilities assigned to the individuals and the extent of their participation (whether whole time or part time).

b) Completion Report

A document listing the outcome of the project/ activity including the contributions made by each of the 'Innovators and Principal Contributors' and 'Directly associated S&T Staff'. The final record shall be signed by each of the Innovators, Principal Contributors and the Project Leader.

c) Project Cost

Certified expenditure for each project/ activity in accordance with Integrated Management & Project Accounting (IMPACT) system.

(ii) By Innovators & Principal Contributors and Directly associated S&T Staff Record Book

A document maintained individually by the 'Innovators and Principal Contributors' and 'Directly associated S&T Staff listing date of his/her joining the project; extent of participation (whether whole time or part time); work allotted and/ or undertaken from time to time; contributions or achievement made, verified and countersigned by the Project Leader/Director.

8.1.4 Distribution of Monies/Fees

i) The names of the 'Innovators and Principal Contributors' and 'Directly associated S&T Staff' should be included in the project proposal put up to the Competent Authority for seeking approval to the project.

j) A Standing Committee shall be set up by the Director to consider and decide on the share of the Innovators and Principal Contributors, Directly associated S&T Staff from the monies realised from licensing of Intellectual Property and knowledgebase as well as the Contract R&D projects and S&T Services.

k) The Project Leader shall recommend to the Standing Committee the share of the individual Innovators, Principal Contributors and Directly associated S&T Staff for a specific project/ activity commensurate with the individual's contributions to the project/ activity as reflected in the Project Records.

l) The Standing Committee shall decide the share of each individual in the light of the recommendations of the Project Leader and taking into consideration the Project Records [as at 8.1.3 (ii) above), wherever necessary.

m) The recommendations of the Standing Committee shall be intimated to each of the Innovators and Principal Contributors and Directly associated S&T Staff and also displayed on the laboratory and other appropriate notice boards. In case no objections / representations are received within fifteen days of the date of notification, then the same can be submitted for consideration and approval by the Management Council.

n) Representations, if any, against the recommendations of the Standing Committee, within the stipulated time limit, shall be reconsidered by the Standing Committee. The fresh recommendations of the Standing Committee, along with the details of representations shall be put up to the Management Council for consideration.

o) The decision of the Management Council shall be intimated to each of the Innovators and Principal Contributors and Directly associated S&T Staff and displayed on appropriate notice boards. Distribution of the monies/fees will then be done if no representations are received against the decision of the Management Council within thirty days of the date of notification.

p) Appeals against the decision of the Management Council, within thirty days of the date of notification, can be made to DG, CSIR through the Director of the laboratory. Decision of DG, CSIR shall be final and binding on all concerned.

q) The portion of the monies/ fee earmarked for the 'Administrative Staff is to be uniform for a salary scale and is to be distributed once a year.

r) A person is entitled for a share from the monies/fees even in the event of his transfer / retirement / resignation from CSIR. In the event of death of a person, his/her legal heir shall be entitled to his / her share of monies/fee.

s) From 1st June 2005, there is no ceiling on the amount of honorarium receivable by an individual from licensing of intellectual property and knowledgebase as well as contract R&D and technical services.

8.2 Distribution of Honorarium for Consultancy Services

8.2.1 The 'Team of Consultants' shall comprise only such staff members who provide intellectual inputs to the specific consultancy work.

8.2.2 Directly associated S&T Staff may comprise staff who have provided direct inputs for the specific project/-activity including Project Assistant, Research Associates and Project Scientist. In case there is no staff under 'Directly associated S&T Staff' category, the share of honorarium earmarked for this category shall then go to Laboratory Reserve Fund (LRF).

8.2.3 Administrative Staff may comprise laboratory staff from Purchase, Stores, Administration, Finance, ESD, Engineering, Utilities, Instrumentation etc.

8.2.4 The portion of the monies/ fee earmarked for the 'Administrative Staff is to be uniform for a salary scale and is to be distributed once a year.

8.2.5 The names of 'Team of Consultants' and 'Directly associated S&T Staff' with the proposed share (%) of honorarium of each individual member should be included in the project proposal put up to the Competent Authority for seeking approval to the project."

40. The aforesaid provisions under Chapter 8 clearly provides for categorization of staff and it also provides that innovators and principal contributors may comprise of scientist and other S & T Staff who provide innovative, developmental, design engineering, experimental data, information testing, analytical repair, fabrication, training and business development marketing inputs for the project activity and directly associated S & T staff comprised of those who provide direct inputs for the specific projects / activity and the kind of persons who could be included under S & T Staff has also been provided. It further provides that administrative staff may comprise of laboratory staff, administration utilities etc.

41. The Clause 8.1.3 also provides that the project records are to be properly maintained, giving the list of the persons, who have joined the project, their strength of participation, whether whole time or part time work was allotted and/or undertaken from time to time, contribution or achievement made verified and counter-signed by the project leader/director. It also provides that the name of innovators and principal contributors and directly associated S & T staff should be included in the project proposal put up to the competent authority for seeking approval of project.

42. The aforesaid clauses clearly reveal that all the staffs associated with the project are to be properly documented and their role is to be specifically mentioned and the names of such persons are to be included in the project proposal before the competent authority for seeking approval of the project.

43. In the present case, so far as the petitioner is concerned, huge amount was arbitrarily disbursed by the petitioner without maintaining proper records and the petitioner had not given any explanation before the authority as to what was the contribution or role of each of such persons to whom the amount was paid. The petitioner has simply given explanation that the same was paid under the instruction of Dr. P.K. Singh, the co-accused of the case.

44. This Court is of the view that the petitioner appears to be in the helm of the affairs so far as the distribution of money to the individuals and manpower is concerned and huge money has been disbursed without their contribution which was in violation of CSIR Guidelines.

45. The case of the petitioner certainly stands on different footing as compared to the case of the co-accused namely, Dr. P.K. Singh, who has been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by coordinate bench of this Court as it was the petitioner, who was directly involved in arbitrary distribution of the money to the manpower and the huge amount was disbursed by the petitioner without maintaining any records regarding their engagement/contribution to the project. This Court finds that there is enough material available on record with regard to direct involvement of the petitioner in the alleged offence.

46. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the view that the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail, and accordingly, the prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

47. Let a soft copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'Fax/email'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Pronounced on 12.06.2026
Saurav/-
Uploaded on 12.06.2026