

**101 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-7256-2023

Date of Decision: February 15, 2023

DEEPAK KUMAR PARJAPAT
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Petitioner

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr.Gursimran Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 CrPC, prayer has been made for grant of concession of pre-arrest bail in FIR No.294 dated 11.11.2022 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC registered at Police Station Division No.5, District Ludhiana.

The allegations levelled against the petitioner are that the petitioner by representing himself to be an authorized representative of Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut (hereinafter referred to as the University) has been alluring young aspirants for getting admission in law course through correspondence. It has been further stated that the petitioner was even conducting classes of law at his own premises followed by delivering of lectures to the students in different batches and even conducting semester-wise examinations at his own residence. Further, it has also been stated that the petitioner has even been providing forged degrees followed by forged enrolment certificates allegedly issued by the Bar Council as well.

Faced with the aforesaid allegations which resulted into registration of aforementioned FIR, the petitioner approached the Court of

learned Addl. Sessions Judge Ludhiana for the purpose of seeking anticipatory bail which was declined vide order dated 01.12.2022, the same being impugned in the present petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated on account of rivalry among the members of local Bar in District Courts, Ludhiana. He further submits that initially a list of 140 members of the District Bar, Ludhiana was prepared by respondent No.3 with the allegations that the petitioner provided them the forged degrees and forged enrolment certificates, however, he points out that on verification the list was reduced to 63 as rest of the degrees and enrolment certificates were found to be genuine and thus submits that in case further verification was carried out, the truth would come out absolving the petitioner of all the allegations.

On the other hand, prayer made herein has been opposed at the instance of learned State Counsel, Sh. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. D.A.G. Punjab with Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate representing respondent No.3 while submitting that the petitioner has been playing with the future of young generation by attracting them to get admission at huge expense by representing himself as the person authorized by the University. Learned counsel representing respondent No.3 further submits that in fact there were some corrections in the original list prepared as regards the forgery committed by the petitioner, however, he submits that mainly the same was merely on account of some typographical error in the enrolment numbers, which was rectified based on further verification. He also submits that neither the complainant nor other individuals ever approached the Bar

Council for the purpose of getting enrolment and the entire fraud/forgery was in fact played upon by the petitioner.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book. I am unable to find any substance in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner.

On a specific query put to learned counsel representing the petitioner, he has not been able to produce any document/authority letter issued by the University authorizing him to grant admissions to the students for distant education law courses or to conduct classes/lectures or even to hold semester-wise examination at his own premises.

In the absence thereof, allegations made in the FIR assume serious nature and granting the relief prayed for at this stage would scuttle the investigation. If contents of the FIR are taken at the face value, the petitioner not only played fraud with the complainant or few others but even caused irreparable loss to the entire judicial system and the legal fraternity particularly by providing forged and fabricated degrees/enrolment certificates. Allegations made in the FIR also require proper investigation in view of the fact that petitioner being an Advocate has moral responsibility towards the society and clients to whom he is representing.

However, the above observations shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case. In view thereof, this Court is not inclined to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the same is hereby dismissed.

15.02.2023
tejwinder

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
---------------------------	--------

<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
---------------------------	---------------