



* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

%

*Reserved on: 22nd December, 2025
Pronounced on: 24th December, 2025*

+

BAIL APPLN. 4967/2025, CRL.M.A. 38305/2025
and CRL.M.(BAIL) 2533/2025

J. VASANTHAN

S/o Late Sh. D. Jeevantham
R/o 0/3, Ruthrappa,
Nayakkan Street, Thirukovillur,
Villupuram District,
Tamil Nadu-605757

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. K. Rajan and Mr. Kartik Chettiar
Advocates.

versus

1. **STATE**

Station House Officer (SHO),
Hauz Khas Police Station,
New Delhi-110016

....Respondent No.1

2. **BAR COUNCIL OF INDIA**

Through its Secretary,
No. 2/6, Siri Fort Institutional Area,
Khel Gaon Marg,
New Delhi-110049

....Respondent No. 2

Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the State with
SI Sidharth.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Neeraj, Mr. T.
Singhdev, Mr. Tanishq Srivastava,
Mr. Amit Gupta, Ms. Yamini Singh
and Mr. Sourabh Kumar, Advocates
for Bar Council of Delhi.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

J U D G M E N T



NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

1. Anticipatory Bail Application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*hereinafter referred to as 'B.N.S.S.'*) Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (*hereinafter referred to as 'Cr.P.C'*), has been filed on behalf of the Applicant J. Vasanthan seeking grant of Anticipatory Bail in FIR No. 396/2025 dated 23.11.2025 under Section 420/468/471/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (*hereinafter referred to as 'IPC'*) registered with the Police Station Hauz Khas.
2. The Applicant submits that he had filed his Anticipatory Bail Application before the learned ASJ, South Saket Courts, New Delhi, which has been dismissed *vide* Order dated 15.12.2025.
3. The case of the Prosecution is that the Respondent No. 2/Bar Council of Delhi, had written a Letter dated 08.10.2025 and thereafter, on 18.11.2025 to the SHO, Police Station Hauz Khas, New Delhi, for the registration of FIR against the Applicant, who had got enrolled with Bar Council of Delhi, fraudulently on the basis of fake LLB Degree and the Mark sheet. The Applicant's license was suspended to practice as an Advocate and subsequently, the matter was sent to Bar Council of India, for removal of his name from the rolls of the Bar Council of Delhi. The Complainant stated that during the removal proceedings of the Applicant from the rolls of Bar Council of India, he had made serious allegations against Mr. Jagdish Yadav and Mr. Arvind Panchal and a request was made for investigations concerning Mr. Jagdish Yadav, employee of the Respondent No.2/BCD and Mr. Arvind Panchal, Advocate. On this Complaint, the present FIR was registered.



4. The Applicant stated that the Bar Council of India sent an intimation notice of removal proceedings to the Applicant informing that the meeting was scheduled to be held on 13.11.2025 at 02:00 p.m.
5. The Bar Council of India, thereafter sent a communication dated 17.11.2025 and enclosed the certified copy of the Resolution dated 17.11.2025, passed by the General House of the Bar Council of India by circulation. The Resolution accepted in *toto* the Report submitted by Sub Committee in removal proceedings concerning the Applicant/Advocate. The Bar Council of India Resolution recorded serious allegations that Mr. Jagdish Yadav, employee of the Bar Council of Delhi, had demanded and received substantial sums of money from the Applicant, to facilitate his enrolment with the Bar Council of Delhi, based on alleged forged LLB Degree and Mark sheets. These actions were reportedly carried out in collusion with Mr. Arvind Panchal, Advocate.
6. The Applicant submits that he had contacted Mr. Arvind Panchal, who instructed him to come to Delhi with necessary documents. Upon arrival, Mr. Panchal introduced him to Mr. Jagdish, a staff member of the Bar Council of Delhi, who collected the Certificates and obtained his signatures on blank Registration Form and ten other blank sheets. Mr. Jagdish demanded Rs.1,00,000/- for registration and Applicant gave him Rs.95,000/- in cash. The enrolment was completed successfully. Subsequently, Mr. Arvind Panchal requested an additional Rs.50,000/- for document verification, which was transferred to him *via* RTGS on 18.12.2023.
7. On 18.09.2025, Mr. Vasanthan received a message from Bar Council of Delhi regarding the suspension of his License dated 16.09.2025 as the



LLB Degree and Mark Sheets, were found to be forged. The Applicant confirmed that he had never studied at Bundelkhand University and that his original documents had been handed over by Mr. Jagdish Yadav, for the registration purpose.

8. The Applicant himself filed a Complaint dated 10.10.2025 before the Bar Council of Delhi against Mr. Jagdish Yadav and Mr. Arvind Panchal, who had illegally misused the original Certificates of the Petitioner, for the purpose of registration. He stated that he was ready and willing and bound to explain if required by the Bar Committee and also made a prayer before the Committee, to review and reconsider the Order dated 16.09.2025, passed by the Bar Council of Delhi.

9. The Applicant submitted that the learned ASJ had granted *Anticipatory Bail to Mr. Jagdish Yadav*, staff of Bar Council of Delhi on 27.11.2025, on the conditions specified therein.

10. The *Respondent No. 2/Bar Council of Delhi* sent a Notice under Section 35(3) of B.N.S.S. in the FIR No. 396/2025 dated 23.11.2025 directing the Applicant to appear at Hauz Khas, Police Station. The Applicant submitted his request Letter dated 03.12.2025 stating that he was facing 'GRADE-I DIASTOLIC DYSFUNCTION'S from 19.11.2025 and his re-check-up date was given by the Madras Medical Mission, already scheduled for 15.12.2025. He requested to grant him any other date after 15.12.2025.

11. The Applicant thereafter, filed the Anticipatory Bail Application dated 10.12.2025, before the learned ASJ, which was dismissed on 15.12.2025



12. The Applicant has sought Bail on the grounds that the learned ASJ failed to appreciate that he had studied at Secondary School (Govt. of Tamil Nadu), B.A. in Tamil from Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu. He did his LLB from Indian Institute of Professional Studies, recognized by the Bhartiya Shiksha Parishad in Raya Pettah High Road, Mylapore, Chennai Branch. He had also qualified All India Bar Examination-XVIII, conducted by the Bar Council of India.

13. The invocation of the Sections of IPC against the Applicant, is wholly untenable as there is no material evidence to establish that he was involved in the fraudulent activity mentioned in the FIR. The Applicant in fact was a Complainant, who had given a Complaint against the staff of BCD and Mr. Arvind Panchal, Advocate, who had introduced him to Mr. Jagdish Yadav and had requested that necessary action be taken against them. No opportunity has been given to the Applicant by Bar Council of India or Bar Council of Delhi, to explain himself.

14. The Suspension Order dated 16.09.2025 was sent by the Bar Council of Delhi, through WhatsApp. Likewise, Bar Council of India had sent a Notice dated 01.11.2025 to the Applicant *vide* e-mail. A chance to explain was given for 13.11.2025 at 02:00 p.m., by the Bar Council of India. The Applicant went to Bar Council of India on 13.11.2025 where the hearing was postponed for the reasons that the Committee had not assembled on that date and he was told that the next date of hearing, shall be intimated soon. The Applicant then returned to his hometown on the same day. The Bar Council of India without any enquiry or explanation from the Applicant, passed the Order dated 17.11.2025 and circulated it in the Press.



15. The Applicant did not possess any intention to abscond from the process of law and is ready to present himself before the Court and the Investigating Officer for the purpose of investigation. He undertakes to face the trial and appear personally on every date of hearing.

16. It is claimed that the dictum of law that the severity of the allegation is not the only consideration, which should result in denial or grant of Bail to the Petitioner, has been ignored by the learned ASJ. The totality of circumstances, deserves to be seen before a person is granted or denied the anticipatory Bail. It has not been considered that the Applicant himself was the Complainant, who had made a Complaint against Mr. Jagdish Yadav and Mr. Arvind Panchal, who had changed his original documents, certificates, without his knowledge or any intimation. It has also not been considered that an amount of Rs. 50,000/- was demanded by Mr. Arvind Panchal on behalf of Mr. Jagdish Yadav for document verification in the month of December, 2023, after the enrolment, which he had transferred on 28.12.2023 to Mr. Arvind Panchal. He had already paid Rs. 95,000/- in the month of June, 2022. The enrolment process was completed in the month of September, 2023. The Applicant claims that he is innocent and hence, has sought the Anticipatory Bail.

17. The **learned ASG on behalf of the Respondent No. 2/Bar Council of Delhi**, and **Learned Add.PP on behalf of the State** had appeared on advance Notice and the arguments were addressed by both the parties.

18. Essentially, the **arguments of the Applicant**, were similar as stated in the Application. It was contended that he had merely signed blank papers and blank enrolment form and had handed over his genuine documents and mark sheets. However, it is Mr. Jagdish Yadav and Mr. Arvind Panchal,



who in connivance with each other, had filed the Mark Sheets and the Degree of Bundelkhand University, Jhansi, even though he had never studied in that University. Furthermore, Rs. 95,000/- had been paid by him to Mr. Jagdish Yadav and additional Rs. 50,000/- for document verification to Mr. Arvind Panchal. He in fact, had been victimised by these two persons, on whom he had relied, with little realisation that in fact, they were involved in a conspiracy to defraud the Applicant.

19. It is vehemently argued that he is a resident of Villupuram, Tamil Nadu and was suffering from heart ailment and was, therefore, unable to appear before the Investigating Officer, on the date that was given. It was not on account of avoiding the joining of investigations but because of the distance and his medical condition that he was unable to travel. It is further argued that though the BCI before cancelling his enrolment, was required to give him an opportunity of being heard and had given him a date to appear on 13.11.2025 but when he went to the Office, he was informed that the Committee is not sitting on that day. Despite that without giving him any Notice, his license has been suspended *vide* Order dated 16.09.2025.

20. In the end, it was argued that he is a respectable man, who has been practicing as an Advocate and has three children to take care of. It is argued that in the aforesaid conspectus of the circumstances, he is entitled to Anticipatory Bail.

21. The **learned ASG on behalf of the Respondent No. 2**, has vehemently opposed the Bail, on the grounds that he himself has admitted giving money to Mr. Jagdish Yadav as well as to Mr. Arvind Panchal, for getting his registration done in the Bar Council of Delhi, on the basis of forged and fabricated Degree and the Mark Sheets. The very fact that he had



paid the money, reflects his complicity with Mr. Jagdish Yadav and Mr. Arvind Panchal, in committing the fraud by submitting the fake Mark Sheets. Mr. Jagdish Yadav is an employee of the Bar Council of Delhi since long and his name and involvement, has raised serious questions about the Advocates being registered in the Bar Council of Delhi, on the basis of fake documents. It is a larger conspiracy, which is required to be investigated and no Anticipatory Bail can be granted to the Applicant.

22. It was also asserted that there is a huge malady infecting the entire system wherein the persons with documents, are getting enrolled in the Bar Council of Delhi, which requires an in depth investigation.

23. **The learned Add. PP on behalf of the Respondent No. 1**, has argued that though the Applicant is claiming himself to be an innocent person and a victim, but in order to show his residence in Delhi, a forged Rent Agreement had been executed and presented, which on verification, has been found to be a forged and fabricated document. For the Applicant to claim that he had no involvement, is clearly disproved from the documents and the investigations.

24. The Anticipatory Bail to the Applicant, is, therefore, opposed.

Submissions heard and the record perused.

25. From the submissions made by the Applicant himself, it is evident that he had sought his registration in the Bar Council of Delhi even though, he is a resident of Villupuram. He had submitted a Rent Deed to establish his residence, which on investigations, was found to be forged.

26. The Applicant has himself stated that he never studied in Bundelkhand University, but had done his LLB from Indian Institute of Professional Studies, recognized by the Bhartiya Shiksha Parishad in Raya



Pettah High Road, Mylapore Chennai Branch. His claim that he had given his documents and signed the blank Enrolment Form and ten blank papers and had submitted his requisite documents, to Mr. Jagdish Yadav, again reflects his complicity in the entire racket of getting a registration in the Bar Council of Delhi, on fake documents. Not only this, he has admitted having made payment of Rs.95,000/- to Mr. Jagdish Yadav and Rs.50,000/- to Mr. Arvind Panchal in December, 2025, which is after the registration was done in September, 2025. For him, at this stage, *prima facie* his direct complicity is *prima facie* made out.

27. Though, the Applicant is trying to project that he was himself a victim, but it has been rightly argued that the repercussions of such registration on fake documents is impacting the entire judicial system. In this regard, it would be pertinent to refer to the observations made in the Case of Ajay Shankar Srivastava vs. Bar Council of India & Anr., (2023) 6 SCC 144 wherein it was observed that due verification of Advocates, who are enrolled with the State Bar Councils, is of utmost importance to preserve the integrity of the administration of justice. Persons who profess to be lawyers, but do not either have the educational qualifications or Degrees/Certificates on the basis of which they can be lawfully granted entry to the Bar, pose a grave danger to the administration of justice to the citizens. It is the duty of every genuine Advocate of the country to ensure that they cooperate with the Bar Council of India, which is seeking to ensure that the certificates of practice is duly verified together with the underlying educational degree certificates. Unless this exercise is carried out periodically, there is a danger that the administration of justice, would be under a serious cloud.



28. It was further observed that there is a larger dimensions of this matter and the direct impact which the enrolment of fake degree-holders and other persons who are not found to be in possession of the qualifications required for entry into the Bar, has on the administration of justice. In the said case, High Powered Committee was directed to be constituted to monitor the process of verification.

29. The possessing of valid degrees from recognized College to get an enrolment in a Bar for practicing as a Counsel is of utmost importance, the significance of which can never be over emphasized. Enrolment of Advocates, on the basis of fake Certificates, not only impacts individual Cases in which they represent the litigant, but has a deleterious effect an entire justice delivery system.

30. The allegations against the Applicant, are serious and require an in-depth investigations to unearth the entire network working to facilitate such registrations; especially in the context of Mr. Jagdish Yadav and Mr. Arvind Panchal, whose names have emerged from the investigations of the Applicant.

31. Considering the gravity of the allegations and that further investigations are required, it is not a case for grant of Anticipatory Bail.

32. In the end, it is pertinent to note that the learned counsel has placed reliance on Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar, (2014) 8SCC 273, to assert his right to Bail. However in the said case, guidelines have been laid down for the manner in which the investigations are to be done and how the Applicant/Accused is required to join the investigations. It does not need any reiteration that the Investigating Officer is bound to follow the guidelines defined in the Case of Arnesh Kumar (supra).



33. The Anticipatory Bail Application is therefore, dismissed and disposed of.

34. The pending Application(s), if any, are also disposed of, accordingly.

**(NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA)
JUDGE**

DECEMBER 24, 2025/RS