



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

203

**CRM-M-4762-2026
Decided on: 01.07.2026**

Vijay Lathwal**.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. R.S. Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of in FIR No.240 dated 16.09.2021, registered under Sections 420, 465, 468, 471, 120-B, 409 IPC read with Section 66, 66-D of Information Technology (Amendment) Act 2008 at Police Station Anaj Mandi, Patiala, District Patiala.
2. Reply by way of an affidavit of Sh. Jangjit Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Posted as Deputy Superintendent of Police, City-II, Patiala on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed in the Court today. The same is taken on record.
3. FIR in the present case was registered with the allegation that several persons were involved in a racket wherein, after accepting huge sum of money, they solved online question papers to help candidates to secure higher marks in the competition for the post of Sub Inspector, Punjab Police. As per the FIR, initially three accused persons were nominated, who were found involved alongwith other



gang members. The accused named in the FIR are (i) Sukhdeep Singh @ Lali, (ii) Gurpreet Singh and (iii) Hardeep Singh.

During the course of investigation, several persons including (iv) Pradeep Kumar, (v) Jasvir Singh, (vi) Avtar Singh, (vii) Krishan, (viii) Lavnish Gupta, (ix) Baljinder Singh, (x) Sukhwinder Singh, (xi) Ankit, (xii) Mohit Chaudhary, (xiii) Gurmeet, (xiv) Deepak Chaudhary, (xv) Mohit Lathal, (xvi) Harpreet Singh and (xvii) Vikas Kumar were also nominated as accused.

4. When accused-Ankit was interrogated, he disclosed that the computers were hacked, enabling him to share the screens while sitting at the Jain Bharti Public School Computer Centre, Jagadhri Road, Industrial Area, Ambala Cantt. He further disclosed that the online examination papers were solved from that location and for this purpose, he had paid an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- per candidate to his co-accused-Lavnish Gupta.

On 28.09.2021, accused-Ankit Kumar made a disclosure statement stating that sitting at the Jain Bharti Public School Computer Centre, Jagadhri Road, Industrial Area, Ambala Cantt., the online question papers were solved by his co-accused Deepak Chaudhary, Mohit Latwal and Vijay Latwal.

5. The prime argument of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner was not directly involved in hacking the computers, rather, as per the allegations, his expertise was utilised solely to solve the papers. Counsel relies upon the order passed qua co-accused Mohit Lathwal(brother of petitioner) who has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 24.05.2024 passed in CRM-M-14700-2024 by Coordinate Bench of this Court (Annexure P-8).

6. None of the contentions noticed here above could be disputed by learned State counsel.



7. In view of applying the principle of parity and considering the aforementioned facts, this Court finds it appropriate to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner also in the present case.

8. Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

9. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.

10. However, it shall be open for the prosecution as well as the complainant to seek revival of the present bail order, in the event, statements made by learned counsel for the petitioner, as recorded here above, are found incorrect, or if the petitioners fail to join and cooperate with the investigation, in terms of the directions mentioned in the present order.

11. With the directions issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.

01.07.2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/NO
YES/NO