



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M-13730-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 18.03.2025

ASHIM TANEJA @ ASEEM TANEJA

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)1. Prayer

This petition has been filed under section 482 Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.21 dated 15.02.2025 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 318(4), 337, 338 (3) 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Jandiala Guru, District Amritsar.

2. Prosecution story, set up in the present case as per the version in the FIR reads as under :-

‘Complaint NO.112-A.P dated 15-02-2025, To, Police Incharge, Amritsar Rural. Sir, it is requested that I am appointed as the Incharge of the District Sanjh Kendra, Amritsar-Rural. Today, I checked the weapon Module of the Sanjh Kendra



Portal. It was found that some files were sent to the D.C. Office, Amritsar, by writing incorrect dispatch numbers. Upon thorough investigation by me, it was found that E-Seva application number 69790947, 68493604, 65676684, 70734449, 70376343, 68070331, 65518512, 66482737, and 65852870 were not entered in the dispatch register of this office. However, these files were sent online from the Sanjh Portal of this office to the D.C. Office, Amritsar. These files contained printed signatures of the Honourable S.S.P. Amritsar-Rural. However, in reality, these files were neither signed by the Honourable S.S.P. Sahib nor arranged by me. In this regard, inquiries were made from Constable Nirmal Singh Number 600/Amritsar-Rural, who is appointed at the Weapon Head Seat. He stated that out of greed, he, along with his friend Aseem Taneja, resident of Jandiala, had prepared the forged signatures of the Honourable S.S.P. Amritsar-Rural Sahib by photocopying them. These signatures were prepared by an acquaintance of Aseem Taneja, resident of Jandiala. After this, the Sanjh Portal Code/Password was shared with him, and the files were sent from Jandiala to the D.C. Office, Amritsar. By doing this, Constable Nirmal Singh Number 600/Amritsar-Rural and his friend have violated the law. Legal action should be taken against them accordingly. Signed/- Manjinder Singh, Inspector Incharge, District Sanjh Kendra, Amritsar-Rural.'

3. Contentions

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He contends that the sole allegation against the petitioner is that while sending the files to the Deputy Commissioner Officer signatures have been forged and the said fact is disputed asserting that during the course of



investigation if IP address is detected the entire truth would come forth. He also argues that thorough investigation has not been conducted and undertakes that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice on instructions from Investigating officer could not make out a case beyond the limited role assigned to the present petitioner as argued by counsel for the petitioner that he was responsible only for furnishing these files to the office of Deputy Commissioner on which the signatures are alleged to be forged and the investigation is under way.

He further submits that in case the petitioner is willing to associate himself in the investigation, he has no objection if this Court considers the prayer for anticipatory bail since no recovery of any nature is to be effected for him and the custodial interrogation for such purpose is not required as such.

4. **Analysis**

After given a thoughtful consideration to the submissions as made, by the counsel for both the parties and considering no objection from the counsel for the State, this Court finds no reason to deny the petitioner the concession of anticipatory bail, wherein the petitioner has bona fide intentions and is willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency within the stipulated time period.



5. **Relief**

Hence, in view of the admitted set of circumstances before this Court, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation and reporting to the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS of which are reproduced below :-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stand cancelled.



The petition in the aforesaid terms stand allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

18.03.2025
anuradha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>