

**CRM-M-33775-2025****(228)****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-33775-2025****Date of Decision: 06.08.2025****ROHIT****... Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF HARYANA****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.25 dated 15.02.2025 registered under Sections 120-B, 409, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC and Sections 3, 7-A, 13 of Prevention of Corruption Act (Section 7-A of P.C. Act, 1988 added later on) at Police Station PGIMS, Rohtak, District Rohtak.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are that the present case was registered on the complaint of Mr. Rohit, Security Officer, UHS, PGIMS Rohtak who alleged that the examination of the MBBS Students in Pt. Bhagwat Dyal Sharma University of Health Sciences, Rohtak, were undertaken in which some students forged the answer sheets and changed them. The scam was carried out by the students in connivance with the employees of Examination Branch and other employees. One complaint in this regard was given by one student to the university, upon which an inquiry committee was formed, which submitted its report to the university on

**CRM-M-33775-2025**

13.02.2025, in which 24 students were named, who committed the alleged scam/forges/fraud. Further 17 employees were also named, who allegedly took part in this fraud including the present petitioner. The report suggested that administrative negligence was involved, leading to the manipulation of the answer sheets. The Enquiry Committee Report pointed to the involvement of officials from the examination center, branch employees, and staff from the service-providing company in this malpractice and the students. The committee confirmed on the basis of the evidence, that the allegations of tampering with the examination answer sheets were correct. The committee verified records of only 30 candidates and others could also be examined, if, required by the inquiry Committee. On the basis of this, case bearing FIR No. 25 dated 15.02.2025 under sections 409, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of Indian Penal Code and 7-A, 13 P.C. Act, 1988 was registered at Police Station PGIMS Rohtak. During investigation, the petitioner along with co-accused Rohit and Deepak were arrested in this case after finding sufficient evidence regarding their involvement in the occurrence.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. Be that as it may, the investigation stands completed. As the petitioner is in custody since 17.02.2025 but none of the 28 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned counsel State while referring to the reply dated 31.07.2025 contends that the petitioner is a Computer



CRM-M-33775-2025

Operator and was one of the employees who facilitated the commission of offences in question. Therefore, he is not entitled to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 17.02.2025 and that none of the 28 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

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

6. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 17.02.2025 and none of the 28 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and petitioner-Rohit S/o Ramphal is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

9. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

06.08.2025

JITESH

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No
Whether reportable:- Yes/No