

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3026 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-66 Year-2024 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Purnia

-
1. Manjeet Kumar S/O Mala Singh R/O Village- Hathi Tola, P.S- Maner, Distt.- Patna.
 2. Mandeep Kumar S/O Dilip Prasad R/O Village- Manpur Suritola, P.S- Muffasil, Distt.- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anirudh Kumar Sinha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned

APP for the State. Perused the case diary called for in Cr. Misc.

No. 3015 of 2025.

2. The petitioners seek bail in connection with Purnea
Cyber P.S. Case No. 66 of 2024 instituted for the offences
under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2), 111
of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Sections 65, 66(C), 66(D)
of the Information and Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 9, 10
& 11 of the Public Examination (Prevention of Unfair Means)
Act, 2024.

3. As per prosecution case, on the information given
by the Informant, who was assigned as a Co-ordinator at the
Purnia Digital Online Examination Center at Hansda Road,



Gulabbag, Purnia, the police officials reached there and during verification, 12 (twelve) fake candidates including the petitioners were caught who were found using forged admit cards, Aadhaar cards and other documents and were arrested. On query, they confessed of appearing in the examination in place of actual students in exchange of money. They also disclosed that the original students were present in a nearby flat where their e-admit cards were being verified for 'bio-metric In-Out' access. Later on, the police raided the said flat and recovered e-devices and other incriminating materials. It is also revealed that before the entry of the fake candidates, the owner of the lab Vivek Kumar, his partner Roshan Kumar S/o Suryadeo Mandal, Rahul Raj and other accomplices used to prepare the documents at the Purnia Digital Center. Subsequently, Purnia Digital staff members, 07 (seven) in number, who are alleged to have helped in organizing the cheating process, were also arrested. The police also arrested two persons, namely Roshan Kumar S/o Ajay Singh and Kunal Kumar who were fleeing from the Center, in front of the Purnia Digital Examination Center on the road. From the place of location, connecting network wire and other technical items were recovered. From the flat of Suresh Chandra Saha, 14



(fourteen) original examinees, were also arrested and, on search, various documents including fake admit cards, Aadhaar cards, original IDs of the students etc. were recovered. From outside the flat, the police also seized Tata Harrier car with a cheque of Rs. 60,000/- and Rs. 4,20,400/- in cash. The police also recovered several incriminating articles from the Hotel Shine. Two motorcycles and one scooter were also seized.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence as alleged against them and have falsely been implicated in the present case. As per allegation, the petitioners were sitting in the examination hall in place of original students. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were not arrested from the examination hall. Nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioners. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the recovered mobile phone and charger from the room of the petitioners belong to the petitioners. He further submits that the police after arresting the petitioners took confessional statement of the petitioners which has no evidentiary value in the eye of law. Save and except confessional statements of the petitioners, there is nothing adverse against them in the entire record of the



case. The petitioners were not arrested from the examination hall. There is a non-compliance of Section 103 of the B.N.S.S. which creates a serious doubt in the prosecution case. The petitioners have no criminal antecedent and are languishing in judicial custody since 14.11.2024 without any rhymes or reason. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners. He submits that the petitioners are named in the F.I.R. and, according to seizure list, several articles have been seized from the possession of the accused persons and other places. He further submits that during investigation, all the witnesses have supported the factum of occurrence and involvement of the petitioners and, accordingly, the Investigating Officer, after completion of investigation, submitted charge-sheet against the petitioners under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2), 111 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Sections 65(C) & 66(D) of the Information and Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 9, 10 & 11 of the Public Examination (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 2024. Learned counsel for the State further submits that the petitioners have also confessed their guilt of being involved in



the alleged occurrence. The offence alleged is serious in nature and, hence, the petitioners do not deserve bail.

6. In the opinion of this Court, public examinations play a crucial role in shaping the educational and professional futures of individuals. The credibility and fairness of these examinations are fundamental to ensure equal opportunities for all candidates. In this case, it is alleged that the petitioners along with the other co-accused persons in connivance with criminal conspiracy and in organized way committed the offence of cheating, cheating by impersonation, forgery of valuable security and fraudulently and dishonestly used as genuine any document or electronic record which they know or have reason to believe to be a forged document or electronic record. They have also committed an offence under the I.T. Act as well as the Public Examinations (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 2024 recently passed by the Parliament. Such type of offence undermines the principles of meritocracy, equal opportunities, integrity of system and ultimately impacting the credibility of qualifications and the over all social fabric.

7. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case and after going through the entire records of this case as



also taking into account the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at this stage.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected with a direction to the court below to conclude the trial expeditiously preferably within a period of six months from today.

9. If the trial is not concluded within the aforesaid period of six months, the petitioners will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail before the court below which will be disposed of on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

