

CRM-M-14460-2023 (O & M)

::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14460-2023 (O & M)

Date of decision: 20.04.2023

Ajaib Singh

..... Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Bhinder, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, DAG, Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.02 dated 27.11.2020 under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC registered at Police Station Punjab State Crime Police Station, SAS Nagar, District Crime Wing.

2. The brief facts of the case are that a complaint had been received in the office of the Bureau of Investigation, Punjab, to the effect that Kuljinder Singh, Baljinder Singh and others had filed a CWP-13159-2020 (O & M) titled as 'Kuljinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others' and CWP No.8552-2020 (O & M) titled as 'Baljinder Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others' before the Punjab and Haryana

CRM-M-14460-2023 (O & M)

::2::

PSPCL at the time of recruitment of Assistant Linemen. The High Court had passed an order dated 27.10.2022 to the effect that since there were allegations of fake experience certificates, etc. being accepted by PSPCL, the DIG/IG, Crime was to file an affidavit narrating the investigation conducted and also to examine the role of the officials/officers of PSPCL in accepting the alleged fake experience certificates. On the basis of the order of the High Court, an investigation begun and the writ petitioners-Kuljinder Singh and Baljinder Singh were joined in the investigation. Baljinder Singh got recorded a statement to the effect that in the month of October, 2019, PSPCL had advertised posts for the recruitment of the Assistant Linemen and he had applied for the same. He had been called for counselling and had produced all his educational certificates. As per the advertisement, 10 experience certificates were required and on this count, many candidates had got recruited by furnishing fake experience certificates. There were irregularities in this recruitment due to which he (Baljinder Singh) alongwith 06 other candidates had filed CWP-8552 of 2020 before the High Court. Apart from this, 22 more candidates had filed CWP-13159-2020 and in these petitions, the PSPCL had filed their responses. He (Baljinder Singh) further stated that on 06.09.2020, they had filed an application in the High Court in which they had mentioned Baljinder Singh son of Jarnail Singh, Bahadur Singh Jabandha son of Gurdev Singh, Kamaldeep Singh son of Kartar Singh, Jaswinder Singh son of Darshan Singh, Pargat Singh son of Indraj Singh, Gurpreet Singh son of Darshan Singh, Palwinder Singh son of

CRM-M-14460-2023 (O & M)

::3::

Malkit Singh and Malwinder Singh son of Sukhdarshan Singh having joined by producing fake experience certificates.

The PSPCL had also conducted an investigation of 04 candidates at their own level and it was found that Kamaldeep Singh and Malwinder Singh had produced fake certificates. Legal action was sought against the accused.

Thereafter, the writ petitioner Kuljinder Singh had joined investigation and got recorded his statement that in 2019, he had applied for the post of Assistant Lineman, had been called for counselling and had produced all the educational certificates. However, he had not been selected as he was not having any experience certificate. Thereafter, he had come to know that some candidates had produced fake certificates on account of which he alongwith 22 other candidates had filed writ petitions bearing CWP-13159 of 2020 and CWP-8552-2020.

During investigation, Vipin Kumar, Assistant Manager of PSPCL also joined investigation alongwith the record and got recorded his statement that for 3500 vacancies, 4756 candidates had applied online and the documents were checked by 11 committees and appointment letters were issued to 2393 candidates after consideration by a selection panel in which about 1684 candidates had obtained experience certificates. Thereafter, 29 writ petitioners had filed petitions before the High Court and on the basis of the orders passed in the said petitions, the experience certificates of Assistant Linemen were verified from the firms and directors who had issued the

CRM-M-14460-2023 (O & M)

::4::

Kartar Singh and Malwinder Singh son of Sukhdarshan Singh had furnished certificates which were forged.

On the basis of the above statements, the investigation of the present case was conducted and the instant FIR came to be registered against the accused.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegation against the petitioner that he had obtained employment as an Assistant Linemen in the PSPCL by providing fake and fictitious experience certificate is incorrect. In fact, the petitioner has committed no offence whatsoever. There are no specific allegations or attributions against the petitioner. The petitioner had worked with M/s B.D. Security Pvt. Ltd. for a period of five years for which his experience certificate was duly issued. Therefore, as the petitioner was ready and willing to join investigation, he was entitled to the grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, while referring to the reply dated 18.04.2023 contends that during the course of investigation, it transpired that the petitioner-Ajaib Singh had not only been issued an incorrect experience certificate by M/s B.D. Security Pvt. Ltd. but had also been issued a forged experience certificate by another accused-Teja Singh Dhillon owner of Dhillon Electric Store, Bathinda as well, pursuant to which, he was nominated as an accused in the present FIR on 03.03.2023. He contends that the petitioner had produced the aforementioned forged experience certificate issued by the accused-Teja Singh Dhillon to take

CRM-M-14460-2023 (O & M)

::5::

therefore, contends that the nature of the allegations against the petitioner did not entitle him to the grant of anticipatory bail as the offence was prima facie established.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of '***Sumitha Pradeep Vs. Arun Kumar C.K. & Anr. 2022(4) RCR (Criminal) 977***', held that merely because custodial interrogation was not required by itself could not be a ground to grant anticipatory bail. The first and the foremost thing the Court hearing the anticipatory bail application is to consider is the prima facie case against the accused. The relevant extract of the judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

"It may be true, as pointed out by learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.1, that charge-sheet has already been filed. It will be unfair to presume on our part that the Investigating Officer does not require Respondent No.1 for custodial interrogation for the purpose of further investigation.

Be that as it may, even assuming it a case where Respondent No.1 is not required for custodial interrogation, we are satisfied that the High Court ought not to have granted discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

We are dealing with a matter wherein the original complainant (appellant herein) has come before this Court praying that the anticipatory bail granted by the High Court to the accused should be cancelled. To put it in other words, the complainant says that the High Court wrongly exercised its discretion while granting anticipatory bail to the accused in a very serious crime like POCSO and, therefore, the order passed

CRM-M-14460-2023 (O & M)

::6::

by the High Court granting anticipatory bail to the accused should be quashed and set aside. In many anticipatory bail matters, we have noticed one common argument being canvassed that no custodial interrogation is required and, therefore, anticipatory bail may be granted. There appears to be a serious misconception of law that if no case for custodial interrogation is made out by the prosecution, then that alone would be a good ground to grant anticipatory bail. Custodial interrogation can be one of the relevant aspects to be considered along with other grounds while deciding an application seeking anticipatory bail. There may be many cases in which the custodial interrogation of the accused may not be required, but that does not mean that the prima facie case against the accused should be ignored or overlooked and he should be granted anticipatory bail. The first and foremost thing that the court hearing an anticipatory bail application should consider is the prima facie case put up against the accused. Thereafter, the nature of the offence should be looked into along with the severity of the punishment. Custodial interrogation can be one of the grounds to decline custodial interrogation. However, even if custodial interrogation is not required or necessitated, by itself, cannot be a ground to grant anticipatory bail.”

7. In the instant case, the allegations against the petitioner are of using a forged experience certificate to obtain Government employment. The said allegations are extremely serious as the offence against the petitioner is prima facie established. By the act and conduct of the persons such as the petitioner, eligible candidates are deprived of their right to seek

CRM-M-14460-2023 (O & M) ::7::

Government employment. Therefore, this conduct on the part of the petitioner cannot be condoned in any manner whatsoever.

8. In view of the aforementioned discussion, I find no merit in the present petition and the same is dismissed.

9. However, it is made clear that the observations in this order are only for the purposes of deciding this anticipatory bail application and the Trial Court is free to adjudicate upon the matter in accordance with law.

April 20, 2023
sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No