

(213)

2025:PHHC:120956



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-48621-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.09.2025**

KHUSHBOO

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Mohit Saroha, Advocate with
Ms. Dimpy Chhillar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, Asstt. A.G., 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 7, 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 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 others came to be nominated as accused.

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 30.06.2025 but none of the 28 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, she is entitled to the concession of bail *moreso* when co-

accused Rohit has been granted the concession of bail vide order dated 06.08.2025 (Annexure P-9).

4. On the other hand, the learned counsel State contends that the petitioner facilitated the impersonation of the actual candidates for an amount of Rs.25,000/- each. The allegations levelled against her do not entitle her to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 30.06.2025 and that none of the 28 prosecution witnesses has 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 her co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 30.06.2025 and none of the 28 prosecution witnesses has 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 moreso when co-accused Rohit has been granted the concession of bail vide order dated 06.08.2025 (Annexure P-9).

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and petitioner-Khushboo W/o Nishant Kumar is ordered to be released on bail subject to her furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The petitioner (or anyone on her 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

05.09.2025

JITESH

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