



1

MCRC-4200-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK RUSIA

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRADEEP MITTAL

ON THE 17th OF FEBRUARY, 2026MISC. CRIMINAL CASE No. 4200 of 2026*RAMGOPAL MEENA**Versus**THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH*

Appearance:

Shri Adarsh Singh Chauhan - Advocate along with Shri Amitabh Gupta -
Advocate for applicant through V.C.

Shri Ritwik Parashar - Government Advocate for respondent/State.

ORDER

Per. Justice Pradeep Mittal

1. This is the first application filed by the applicant under Section 438 of Cr.P.C/482 of B.N.S.S. for grant of anticipatory bail apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.74 of 2025 registered at Police Station - Cyber and High Tech Crimes, Bhopal (M.P.) for the offences punishable under Sections 61(2), 316(4), 319(2), 339, 340(2), 318(4), 336(4), 318(2) of the BNS and Section 42,66,66-C, 66-D of the Information Technology Act. Sections 111, 238, 241, and 61 of the BNS and Sections 35,36 and 42 of the Aadhar (Targeted Delivery of Financial and other subsidies, Benefits and Services) Act and Sections 3, 4 of the Pariksha Adhiniyam.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that a recruitment examination for Police Constable (PCRT-2023) was conducted in the State of Madhya Pradesh. During the course of investigation of Crime No. 74/2025 registered at Cyber



Police Station, Bhopal. The present applicant was a duly selected candidate of PCRT-2023 and had joined service at PHQ, District Anuppur, and was subsequently deputed to PTS Tighra, Gwalior, for training. During investigation, the prosecution received information indicating that the applicant had made changes in his Aadhaar record near the relevant period of the examination. On scrutiny of Aadhaar update history and related digital records, suspicion arose that the said update could be connected with the larger conspiracy of impersonation and tampering of biometric data by certain candidates to secure selection fraudulently. Accordingly, a notice was issued to the applicant for appearance and production of relevant documents. The Investigating Agency asserts that custodial interrogation may be necessary to ascertain the role of the applicant, to recover relevant documents and digital evidence, and to identify other members of the alleged conspiracy.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the present crime. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no Aadhaar details were updated with any malicious intent or conspiracy; the correction was made only to rectify clerical errors relating to the parent's name. The petitioner has passed the examination through his own hard work without adopting any illegal means. The implication of the petitioner is based merely on suspicion, and the entire case rests on documentary evidence already in possession of the investigating agency. Therefore, no purpose would be served by custodial interrogation, and the petitioner deserves the benefit of anticipatory bail. The appellant has been made accused on the basis of memorandum of co-accused Ashish Kumar.

4. Learned Government Advocate submits that this offence is related to



manipulation of Aadhar Card issued to the applicant. The applicant with conspiracy with other co-accused changed the biometric and photo in UIDAI to get the benefit in the police recruitment, thus application is liable to be dismissed.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. The accused was selected in the examination 2023 for the constable recruitment. He conspired with other co-accused and changed his biometrics and photograph in his UIDAI Aadhaar card. Taking advantage of this, another person appeared in the examination in place of the candidate, and the accused secured the post of constable. The allegation against the accused is tampering with biometrics, which is a serious offence.

6. It is evident from the case diary that co-accused Ashish has given information during the recording of his evidence that he appeared in the examination in place of the accused/applicant (Ramgopal Meena). Therefore, the presence of the accused/applicant is required during the investigation for taking his fingerprint and relevant documents and for comparing his fingerprint with that on the Aadhaar Card. Therefore, no case is made out for anticipatory bail.

7. Consequently, Misc. Criminal Case is dismissed.

(VIVEK RUSIA)
JUDGE

(PRADEEP MITTAL)
JUDGE