

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 434/2026

Pardeep S/o Raj Kumar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o H. No. 79,
Near Prem Depot, Ashok Vihar, Panipat Haryana - 132103.

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Deepak Chauhan
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Pradeep Kumar Chaudhary, Special P.P. for CBI.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAMIL KUMAR MATHUR

Order

15/04/2026

1. The petitioner has preferred this bail application under Section 482 of BNSS in FIR No. RC0302025A0011 registered at Police Station CBI, ACB, Jaipur for the offence under Sections 419, 420, 468, 471 and 120B of IPC and Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (As amended in 2018).
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI and perused the material available on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that although there is an allegation against the petitioner that he obtained appointment to the post of Inspector in Central Bureau of Narcotics by fraudulent means as his thumb impressions were found to be mismatched, however, the factual aspect is different,

according to the FSL report dated 13.01.2023, the photographs sent for examination were found to be similar and correct. It is contended that the petitioner obtained employment through lawful means and did not indulge in any fraudulent practice while securing the appointment. The appointment letter was issued to the petitioner only after due verification of all relevant documents. Though a termination order was subsequently issued against the petitioner, but he challenged the same before the Central Administrative Tribunal, whereupon he was reinstated and is still continuing in service. Counsel further submits that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are wholly baseless and unfounded. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the Investigating Agency. Therefore, it is prayed that the bail application be allowed.

4. On the contrary, learned Special Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that though it is true that the photographs sent to the FSL were found to be similar but only the photograph of the person who appeared in the examination was sent to the FSL and the photograph affixed on the admit card was not sent for comparison. It is further submitted that stringent action is proposed against the erring officials responsible for the same. The involvement of the petitioner in the alleged offence has been found during investigation and the thumb impressions of the petitioner, taken during the three-tier process of the examination, were not found to be matching and, as per the FSL report, the fingerprints/thumb impressions are dissimilar and unidentical. Learned Special Public Prosecutor further argued that despite being called several

times, the petitioner did not appear for interrogation. It is contended that the allegations against the petitioner disclose his involvement in the commission of serious offences relating to securing appointment in public employment by fraudulent means, which is a matter of grave concern with increasing in tendency. He further submits that the material available on record prima facie reveals the involvement of the petitioner and that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, which is a settled proposition of law. The investigation is still at a nascent stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for a fair and proper investigation.

5. Upon consideration of the rival submissions and the material available on record, and in light of the submissions made by the learned Special Public Prosecutor, particularly regarding the prima facie involvement of the petitioner, the requirement of custodial interrogation of the petitioner and the larger impact on fairness and integrity of the recruitment process, this Court is not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the bail application under Section 482 B.N.S.S. is dismissed.

(PRAMIL KUMAR MATHUR),J