

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

Reserved on 02.05.2025
Pronounced on 11.07.2025

OWP No. 73/2014(O&M)
c/w
CRMC No. 199/2013(O&M)
CRMC No. 200/2013(O&M)
CRMC No. 210/2013(O&M)
CRM(M) No. 681/2023(O&M)

Harpreet Singh and others

...Petitioner(s)/Appellant(s)

Through: Mr. P. N. Raina, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Ajaz Choudhary, Adv.
v/s

Union Territory of J&K and others

.... Respondent(s)

Through: Ms. Monika Kohli, Sr. AAG

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNESH OSWAL, JUDGE.

JUDGMENT

1. In all these petitions, a similar issue is involved and as such, they are being disposed of by a common order, however, it is deemed appropriate to have a brief resume of the relevant facts, specific to each petition separately.

OWP No. 73/2014

2. It is stated that an FIR bearing No. 18/2011 dated 07.02.2011 for offences under sections 467, 468, 271 and 420 RPC and 3/25 Arms Act was registered with Police Station, Janipur against certain persons for possession of 12 bore guns with alleged fake gun licenses issued under the seal and signature of Additional District Magistrate(ADM), Rajouri. During investigation of the case, hundreds of gun licenses issued from the office of Additional District Magistrate (ADM), Rajouri and Sub Divisional Magistrate (SDM), Mendhar were seized. A Special

OWP No. 73/2014 along with connected matters

Investigation Team (SIT) comprising of four officers was constituted to investigate the case. During investigation, SIT implicated the petitioners on the ground that the gun licenses were issued by the office of ADM, Rajouri and SDM, Rajouri without following the procedure, and after receiving the money from the license holders. It was also stated that the issuing officer was not competent to issue such licenses. It is stated that when the investigation in FIR No. 18/2011 was complete, SDPO City West adopted a novel procedure and in total ignorance of the mandate given to the Special Investigation Team, sent a docket to SSP Rajouri seeking registration of FIR against the accused named in the said docket including the petitioners with Police Station, Rajouri wherein, it was also stated that while conducting investigation, he found certain licenses, as mentioned in the docket, having been issued by the then ADM Rajouri allegedly in connivance with the other accused persons, as mentioned in the docket/letter and on verification, they were found to be fake and false. Senior Superintendent of Police, Rajouri forwarded the said communication to SHO, Police Station, Rajouri pursuant to which, FIR No. 363/2011 for offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 161, 165 A, 201, 120-B RPC, 3/25 Arms Act, 5(2)(3) PC Act was registered on 16.07.2011 against the petitioners and certain other persons.

3. The quashing of FIR bearing No. 363/2011 is being sought on the ground that once FIR No. 18/2011 dated 07.02.2011 has been registered for offences under sections 467, 468, 271 and 420 RPC and 3/25 Arms Act in respect of the same incident with Police Station, Janipur, Jammu,

OWP No. 73/2014 along with connected matters

registration of second FIR is unwarranted as such, FIR No. 363/2011 (supra) is required to be quashed.

CRMC No. 200/2013:

4. In this petition, the petitioners, who are the Government employees, are seeking quashing of the same FIR i.e. FIR No. 363/2011 for offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 161, 165 A, 201, 120-B RPC, 3/25 Arms Act, 5(2)(3) PC Act of Police Station, Rajouri, which is also the subject matter of OWP No. 73/2014, on the similar ground that the registration of second FIR is not permissible.

CRMC No. 210/2013:

5. The petitioners, who are the Government employees, are seeking quashing of FIR bearing No. 102/2011 registered with Police Station, Mendhar for offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 165, 201, 120-B RPC, 3/25 Arms Act and 5(2)(3) P. C. Act, on the ground that the respondents have no authority under law to go ahead with the investigation in the said FIR when the same incident is subject matter of investigation in FIR No. 18/2011 dated 07.02.2011 under sections 467, 468, 271 and 420 RPC and 3/25 Arms Act registered with Police Station, Janipur, Jammu.

CRMC No. 199/2013

6. The petitioner, who is a Government employee, is seeking quashing of FIR No. 145/2012 of Police Station, Kandi, Rajouri for offences under sections 420, 471, 467 RPC on the similar ground that once an FIR bearing No. 18/2011 has been registered with the Police Station Janipur in respect of

OWP No. 73/2014 along with connected matters

same incident, the registration of second FIR in respect of the same incident, is not permissible.

CRM(M) No. 681/2023:

7. The petitioners, who are the Government employees, are seeking quashing of FIR No. 51/2015 dated 07.04.2015 for offences under sections 420, 467, 471, 120-B RPC registered with Police Station, Thanamandi on the same grounds as urged in the aforesaid petitions that once FIR No. 18/2011 has been registered, the second FIR bearing No. 51/2015 at Police Station, Thanamandi cannot be registered in respect of the same incident. Besides, it is also stated that a chargesheet was filed in case FIR No. 18/2011 in respect of 12 fake gun licenses, but the learned Special Judge Anti-Corruption Jammu vide order dated 10.01.2015, has returned the chargesheet to the Investigating Agency to take note of the observations made by the court and to bifurcate the challan accordingly.
8. Status report has been filed by the respondents in CRMC No. 199/2013, wherein it is stated that on 23.11.2012, a letter dated 20.11.2012 was received by the Police Station through dak along with letter dated 07.11.2012 of the Additional District Magistrate, Rajouri mentioning therein that Manager, Eagle Eye Security and Services, Ahmedabad (Gujrat) vide letter dated 17.10.2012 had requested the ADM, Rajouri for verification of Arms license No. 189/DM/Rajouri/98 shown to be issued in favour of Sh. Kashmir Singh S/o. Lochan Singh R/o. Budhal, Tehsil Koteranka District Rajouri. In reference to the license mentioned above, it was found that it in fact was issued in favour of Naib Subedar V. D.

OWP No. 73/2014 along with connected matters

Sharma s/o. G. C. Sharma and not in the name of Kashmir Singh. The license was found valid up to 15.09.2012 and thereafter was shown to have been renewed up to 15.09.2015 under the forged signature of the former Additional District Magistrate, Rajouri who was relieved from there on 26.12.2011 and on receipt of this report, FIR No. 145/2012 for offences under sections 420, 471, 467 RPC was registered with Police Station, Kandi and investigation was entrusted to ASI Abdul Majid.

9. The status report has also been filed by the respondents in CRMC No. 210/2013, wherein, a reference has been made to FIR No. 18/2011 registered with Police Station, Janipur Jammu and it is stated that the investigation further disclosed that some fake gun licenses have been prepared in the offices ADM Rajouri and SDM Mendhar. Accordingly, one docket in respect of 216 fake licenses and another in respect of 179 fake gun licenses were sent to SHO Police Station, Rajouri and SHO Police Station, Mendhar respectively for registration of cases. Thereafter, FIR No. 363/2011 for offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 161, 165 A, 201, 120-B RPC, 3/25 Arms Act, 5(2)(3) PC Act was registered on 16.07.2011 with Police Station, Rajouri and FIR No. 102/2011 was registered with Police Station, Mendhar for offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 161, 165-A, 201, 120-B RPC, 3/25 Arms Act and 5(2) (3) P. C. Act. Investigation in both these FIRs stands transferred to SIT for further investigation. One Mukhtar Ahmed Choudhary (SDM Mendhar/ACD/ADM Rajouri), is the main accused in all three cases i.e. FIR No. 18/2011 of Police Station, Janipur, FIR No. 363/2011 registered

OWP No. 73/2014 along with connected matters

with Police Station, Rajouri and FIR No. 102/2011 of Police Station, Mendhar, whereas Qasim Hussain S/o. Fazal Din is involved in FIR No. 363/2011 and FIR No. 102/2011. Yasser Quershi is accused in FIR No. 18/2011 of Police Station Janipur, Jammu and FIR No. 102/2011 of Police Station Mendhar. Punjab Singh is involved in two cases i.e. FIR No. 363/2011 and FIR No. 102/2011 and Tanveer Ahmed is accused in FIR No. 363/2011.

10. Mr. P. N. Raina, learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioners has vehemently argued that once FIR No. 18/2011 dated 07.02.2011 has been registered with Police Station, Janipur Jammu, registration of subsequent FIR in respect of the same incident, is not permissible in law. He has placed reliance upon the judgments of the Apex Court in the case of ***T. T. Antony vs. State of Kerala, (2001) 6 SCC 181*** and ***Amitbhai v the Central Bureau of Investigation and another, (2013) 6 SCC 348***.
11. On the contrary, Ms. Monika Kohli, learned Sr. AAG representing the official respondents has argued that the FIRs sought to be quashed through the medium of above mentioned petitions are not the second FIRs in respect of the same incident but these FIRs are in respect of the distinct offences committed by the petitioners and the registration of second FIR is prohibited in respect of same incident only but when offence of forgery is committed by the same person in connivance with the other persons, it would not constitute the commission of offence within same transaction but offence committed during the course of different transactions, warranting the registration of fresh FIR(s).

12. Heard and perused the record.
13. The record depicts that the FIR No. 18/2011 dated 07.02.2011 was registered with Police Station Janipur Jammu for offences under sections 467, 468, 471 and 420 RPC and 3/25 Arms Act when two persons carrying 12 bore guns coming from Chinnore towards Roop Nagar, Janipur, Jammu were intercepted and on enquiry, disclosed their identities as Nasir and Mohd. Rafiq. They produced their gun licenses issued by SDM Mendhar, but it was found that the different addresses of the owners were mentioned as Kupwara, Kathua and Budhal. As the matter involved an issue of public importance, a SIT was constituted comprising of four officers headed by Dy.S.P Shiv Kumar Singh Chouhan, SDPO City West. During investigation, it was found that some fake gun licenses were prepared in the office of ADM Rajouri and SDM Mendhar. Accordingly, one docket in respect of 216 gun licenses was sent to SHO Police Station Rajouri for registration of FIR, leading to registration of FIR No. 363/2011 for offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 161, 165 A, 201, 120-B RPC, 3/25 Arms Act, 5(2)(3) PC Act dated 16.07.2011 and another docket in respect of 179 gun licenses was sent to SHO Police Station, Mendhar for registration of FIR and accordingly FIR No. 102/2011 was registered with Police Station, Mendhar for offences under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 161, 165-A, 201, 120-B RPC, 3/25 Arms Act and 5(2) (3) P. C. Act.
14. A perusal of FIR No. 51/2015 dated 07.04.2015 of Police Station, Thanamandi reveals that it was reliably learnt that some persons were in illegal possession of gun licenses and guns. After obtaining the verification

OWP No. 73/2014 along with connected matters

from ADM, Rajouri vide communication dated 02.02.2015, it was found that the two gun licenses in possession of Munir Hussain and Mohd. Aslam were genuine whereas, the record of other seven licenses was not traceable. On receipt of this information, FIR bearing No. 51/2015 was registered with Police Station, Thanamandi for offences under sections 420, 467, 471, 120-B RPC on 07.04.2015. When the petitioners were asked to participate, they filed petition CRM(M) No. 681/2023 for quashing FIR No. 51/2015 for offences under sections 420, 467, 471, 120-B RPC registered with Police Station, Thanamandi.

15. Thus, it is evident that only two FIRs were registered i.e. FIR No. 363/2011 of Police Station, Rajouri and FIR No. 102/2011 of Police Station, Mendhar pursuant to the docket of In-charge SIT, who was investigating FIR No. 18/2011.
16. Now the sole issue is whether the FIR(s) registered after registration of FIR No. 18/2011 can be termed as second FIR(s) or not.
17. It needs to be mentioned that the SIT was constituted to investigate FIR No. 18/2011 of Police Station, Janipur, Jammu. Later, FIR No. 363/2011 of Police Station, Rajouri and FIR No. 102/2011 of Police Station, Mendhar were transferred to SIT for investigation. The SIT filed a chargesheet in FIR No. 18/2011 of Police Station, Janipur before the court of learned Special Judge Anticorruption Jammu in respect of 12 fake gun licenses. The then learned Special Judge, Anticorruption Jammu vide order dated 10.01.2015 returned the chargesheet to the Investigating Agency to

bifurcate the challan after taking note of the observations made therein,
which are extracted as under:

“Licenses description whereof is given at S. Nos. 1 & 2, are shown to have been replaced vide entry made by SDM Mendhar, licenses, particulars whereof are given at S. Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 12 are shown to have been issued by DM Rajouri, license at S. No. 4 is shown to have been issued by District Magistrate Poonch, whereas license at S. No. 8 is shown to have been issued by District Magistrate Udhampur. Even the holders of these licenses are stated to be residing in different districts of the State. **This shows that offences, which are subject matter of present challan, have taken place within the territorial jurisdiction of several Courts and offences in respect of all the alleged fake licenses have definitely not taken place within the jurisdiction of this Court. It is only in respect of those licenses that are purported to have been issued by an authority within the jurisdiction of this Court, that the charge sheet can be accepted. Besides this, since issuance of each fake license constitutes a separate offence, as such, as many as 12 offences of same kind alleged to have been committed by the accused, are sought to be tried by the prosecution at one trial by filing a single charge sheet, which in the face of provisions contained in S. 234 Cr.P.C. is impermissible. A perusal of the charge sheet also reveals that despite availing a number of opportunities the prosecution has failed to place on record all the original documents relied upon by it as also the original statements of witnesses recorded under section 161 Cr.P.C. The investigating agency is obliged to place on record all these documents/statements in original while filing its report u/s 173 of Cr.P.C. In the absence of the original record, this Court is not in a position to proceed further in the matter.”**

(emphasis added)

18. In its order dated 10.01.2015, the learned Special Judge Anticorruption, Jammu has recorded that issuance of each fake license constitutes a separate offence and as many as 12 offences of same kind alleged to have been committed by the accused were sought to be tried by the prosecution at one trial by filing a single chargesheet which in the face of provisions contained in section 234 Cr.P.C, is not permissible. This order has not been assailed either by the prosecution or by the accused.
19. In the case of **T. T. Antony (supra)**, the Apex Court has held as under:

20. From the above discussion it follows that under the scheme of the provisions of Sections 154, 155, 156, 157, 162, 169, [170](#) and [173](#) of Cr.P.C. only the earliest or the first information in regard to the commission of a cognizable offence satisfies the requirements of [Section 154](#) Cr.P.C. **Thus there can be no second F.I.R. and consequently there can be no fresh investigation on receipt of every subsequent information in respect of the same cognizable offence or the same occurrence or incident giving rise to one or more cognizable offences. On receipt of information about a cognizable offence or an incident giving rise to a cognizable offence or offences and on entering the F.I.R. in the station house diary, the officer in charge of a Police Station has to investigate not merely the cognizable offence reported in the FIR but also other connected offences found to have been committed in the course of the same transaction or the same occurrence and file one or more reports as provided in Section 173 of the Cr.P.C.**

(emphasis added)

21. In the case of **Amitbhai (supra)**, it has been held that registration of second FIR is impermissible when during investigation of a cognizable offence, other offences are found to have been committed in the course of same transaction or the same occurrence, and the citizen cannot be subjected to fresh investigation in respect of commission of one or more offences arising out of same incident or occurrence. The relevant paras are extracted as under:

58.4 Further, on receipt of information about a cognizable offence or an incident giving rise to a cognizable offence or offences and on entering FIR in the Station House Diary, the officer-in-charge of the police station has to investigate not merely the cognizable offence reported in the FIR but also other connected offences found to have been committed in the course of the same transaction or the same occurrence and file one or more reports as provided in [Section 173](#) of the Code. Sub-section (8) of [Section 173](#) of the Code empowers the police to make further investigation, obtain further evidence (both oral and documentary) and forward a further report(s) to the Magistrate. A case of fresh investigation based on the second or successive FIRs not being a counter case, filed in connection with the same or connected cognizable offence alleged to have been committed in the course of the same transaction and in respect of which pursuant to the first FIR either investigation is underway or final report under [Section 173\(2\)](#) has been forwarded to the Magistrate, is liable to be interfered with by the High Court by exercise of power under [Section 482](#) of the Code or under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution.

58.5 First Information Report is a report which gives first information with regard to any offence. There cannot be second FIR in respect of the same offence/event because whenever any further information is received by the investigating agency, it is always in furtherance of the first FIR.

58.6 In the case on hand, as explained in the earlier paras, in our opinion, the second FIR was nothing but a consequence of the event which had taken place on 25/26.11.2005.-----

58.7 For vivid understanding, let us consider a situation in which Mr. 'A' having killed 'B' with the aid of 'C', informs the police that unknown persons killed 'B'. During investigation, it revealed that 'A' was the real culprit and 'D' abetted 'A' to commit the murder. As a result, the police officer files the charge sheet under [Section 173\(2\)](#) of the Code with the Magistrate. Although, in due course, it was discovered through further investigation that the person who abetted Mr. 'A' was 'C' and not 'D' as mentioned in the charge sheet filed under [Section 173](#) of the Code. In such a scenario, uncovering of the later fact that 'C' is the real abettor will not demand a second FIR rather a supplementary charge sheet under [section 173\(8\)](#) of the Code will serve the purpose.

58.9 Administering criminal justice is a two-end process, where guarding the ensured rights of the accused under Constitution is as imperative as ensuring justice to the victim. It is definitely a daunting task but equally a compelling responsibility vested on the court of law to protect and shield the rights of both. Thus, a just balance between the fundamental rights of the accused guaranteed under the Constitution and the expansive power of the police to investigate a cognizable offence has to be struck by the court. **Accordingly, the sweeping power of investigation does not warrant subjecting a citizen each time to fresh investigation by the police in respect of the same incident, giving rise to one or more cognizable offences.** As a consequence, in our view this is a fit case for quashing the second F.I.R to meet the ends of justice.

(emphasis added)

22. In **Amitbhai case (supra)**, illustration given by the Apex Court in Paragraph 58.7 is very relevant, which provides that it is only in respect of the same occurrence or the same incident that the registration of second FIR is impermissible. From both the judgments as mentioned above, it becomes crystal clear that once an FIR has been registered in respect of a cognizable offence, and if during investigation, additional offence(s) is/are found to have been committed in the course of same transaction or occurrence, then the registration of second FIR is not permissible.

23. Further, in the case of *State of Rajasthan vs. Surinder Singh Rathore, 2025 INSC 248* after taking note of its various earlier pronouncements in respect of the permissibility of registration of second FIR, the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under:

8.3 The position regarding the second FIR has been clarified by a Three-Judge Bench of this Court in *UpkarSingh v. Ved Prakash*⁸. The relevant discussion made in the judgment is extracted herein below for ready reference :

21. From the above it is clear that even in regard to a complaint arising out of a complaint on further investigation under the court culminating in another complaint is permissible.

22. A perusal of the judgment of this Court in [Ram Lal Narang v. State \(Delhi Admn\)](#) also shows that even in cases where a prior complaint is already registered, a counter-complaint is permissible but it goes further and holds that even in cases where a first complaint is registered and investigation initiated, it is possible to file a further complaint by the same complainant based on the material gathered during the course of investigation. Of course, this larger proposition of law [laid down in Ram Lal Narang](#) case is not necessary to be relied on by us in the present case. Suffice it to say that the discussion in [Ram Lal Narang](#) case is in the same line as found in the judgments in *Kari Choudhary* and *State of Bihar v. J.A.C. Saldanha*. However, it must be noticed that in [T.T. Antony](#) case, [Ram Lal Narang](#) case was noticed but the Court did not express any opinion either way.

23. Be that as it may, if the law [laid down by](#) this Court in [T.T. Antony](#) case is to be accepted as holding that a second complaint in regard to the same incident filed as a counter-complaint is prohibited under the Code then, in our opinion, such conclusion would lead to serious consequences. This will be clear from the hypothetical example given hereinbelow i.e. if in regard to a crime committed by the real accused he takes the first opportunity to lodge a false complaint and the same is registered by the jurisdictional police then the aggrieved victim of such crime will be precluded from lodging a complaint giving his version of the incident in question, consequently he will be deprived of his legitimated right to bring the real accused to book. This cannot be the purport of the Code.

24. We have already noticed that in [T.T. Antony](#) case, this Court did not consider the legal right of an aggrieved person to file counterclaim, on the contrary from the observations found in [the said judgment](#) it clearly indicates that filing a counter-complaint is permissible.”

8.4 In [Babubhai](#) (supra), it was observed that:

“21. In such a case the court has to examine the facts and circumstances giving rise to both the FIRs and the test of sameness is to be applied to find out whether both the FIRs relate to the same incident in respect of the same occurrence or are in regard to the incidents which are two or more parts of the same transaction. If the answer is in the affirmative, the second FIR is liable to be quashed. However, in case, the contrary is proved, where the version in the second FIR is different and they are in respect of the two different incidents/crimes, the second FIR is permissible. In case in respect of the same incident the accused in the first FIR comes forward with a different version or counterclaim, investigation on both the FIRs has to be conducted.” (Emphasis supplied)

8.5 In [Nirmal Singh Kahlon v. State of Punjab](#) this Court held, in the following terms that when a new discovery is made, the second FIR would be maintainable. It was said as follows:-

“67. The second FIR, in our opinion, would be maintainable not only because there were different versions but when new discovery is made on factual foundations. Discoveries may be made by the police authorities at a subsequent stage. Discovery about a larger conspiracy can also surface in another proceeding, as for example, in a case of this nature. If the police authorities did not make a fair investigation and left out conspiracy aspect of the matter from the purview of its investigation, in our opinion, as and when the same surfaced, it was open to the State and/or the High Court to direct investigation in respect of an offence which is distinct and separate from the one for which the FIR had already been lodged.”

8.6 Apart from these judgments, reference can also be made to [Ram Lal Narang v. State \(Delhi Admn.\)](#); [Surender Kaushik v. State of U.P.](#); and [P. Sreekumar v. State of Kerala](#).

9. From the above conspectus of judgments, inter alia, the following principles emerge regarding the permissibility of the registration of a second FIR:

9.1 When the second FIR is counter-complaint or presents a rival version of a set of facts, in reference to which an earlier FIR already stands registered.

9.2 When the ambit of the two FIRs is different even though they may arise from the same set of circumstances.

9.3 When investigation and/or other avenues reveal the earlier FIR or set of facts to be part of a larger conspiracy.

9.4 When investigation and/or persons related to the incident bring to the light hitherto unknown facts or circumstances.

9.5 Where the incident is separate; offences are similar or different.

(emphasis added)

24. Thus, the registration of second FIR is permissible when the ambit of second FIR is different even though they may arise from the same set of circumstances or when the investigation and/or other avenues reveal the earlier FIR or set of facts to be part of a larger conspiracy or when the investigation or/and persons related to the incident bring to the light hitherto unknown circumstances or when the incident is separate; offences are similar or different. So far as the present case is concerned, issuance of each fake license constitutes a separate offence and the issuance of fake licenses in favour of different individuals cannot be termed as a part of the same transaction, particularly when the beneficiaries of alleged fake licenses are different. Some accused may be common in the FIR(s) but it cannot be said that FIR registered after the registration of FIR No. 18/2011 is second FIR.
25. In view of what has been said and considered above, this Court does not find any merit in these petitions. The petitioners in OWP No. 73/2014, CRMC No. 200/2013 and CRMC No. 210/2013 could have raised the issue adjudicated by this court in respect of registration of second FIR, as the FIRs impugned in these petitions were registered pursuant to docket of In-charge SIT but in CRMC No. 199/2013 and CRM(M) No. 681/2023, the FIRs were not registered pursuant to docket of In-charge SIT and the petitioners in these petitions have in fact abused the process of law by filing these petitions. Accordingly, the petitions bearing CRMC No. 199/2013 and CRM (M) No. 681/2023 are dismissed with token costs of Rs. 5000/- each to be borne by the petitioners and deposited with the

OWP No. 73/2014 along with connected matters

Registry within the period of fifteen days from today. Other petitions are dismissed without costs.

26. At the same time this Court finds that FIR No. 51/2015 registered with Police Station, Thanamandi and FIR No. 145/2012 registered with Police Station, Kandi are required to be investigated by the SIT already constituted by the Government. Accordingly, Inspector General of Police, Jammu Zone is directed to transfer the investigation in FIR Nos. 145/2012 and FIR No. 51/2015 to the same SIT, constituted to investigate FIR No. 18/2011. Further, the Inspector General of Police, Jammu Zone shall monitor the investigation conducted by the SIT, so as to ensure that the investigation is concluded as expeditiously as possible and the final report is filed before the competent court in accordance with law. This order however shall not preclude the Government from transferring the investigation in all these FIRs to any specialized Investigating Agency such as Anti-Corruption Bureau or Central Bureau of Investigation.
27. Registry to maintain the index and list before the appropriate bench, in the event costs are not deposited.
28. Disposed of.

(RAJNESH OSWAL)
JUDGE

JAMMU:
11.07.2025
Rakesh PS

Whether the order is reportable: Yes/No