



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 197/2025

Sharwanram @ Sharwan Babal S/o Harsukhram, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Saab Ki Dhani, Fitkasani, P.s. Kudi, Distt. Jodhpur (Raj.) (Presently Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

Connected With

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 339/2025

Jairaj Singh S/o Aasu Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Surdhna Chouhanan, P.s. Deshnokh, Distt. Bikaner, (Raj.) (Presently Confined In Central Jail Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through P.p.

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 408/2025

Naresh Dan Charan S/o Shri Ratan Dan Charan, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Diyatra, Police Station Kolayat, District Bikaner. Rajasthan, Presently Resident Of Tilak Nagar, Street No. 06, Jaipur Road, Bikaner, Rajasthan, (Presently In Judicial Custody, Central Jail Ghatgate).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1027/2025

Harshvardhan Kumar Meena S/o Murari Lal Meena, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Salampur Police Station Mahua, District Dausa (Raj.) (At Present Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1028/2025

Sunil Kumar Beniwal S/o Dhimaram, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Halivav, Post Virava, P.s. Chitalwana, Distt. Santhore (Raj.) (Presently Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1424/2025

Manisha Siyag D/o Shri Arjunram Siyag, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Vishwakarma Ganga Shahar, Police Station Ganga Shahar, District Bikaner. (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1425/2025

Rinku Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Naval Kishore Sharma, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Torda P/s Sikandra, District Dausa, Presently Lavkush Nagar, Police Station Sadar, District Dausa, Rajasthan. (Presently Prisoner Central Jail, Ghatgate, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1426/2025

Shyam Pratap Singh S/o Shri Bhagwan Singh, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Lohawat, Vishnavas, P/s Lohawat, District Phalodi, Rajasthan (Currently In Judicial Custody Central Jail Ghatgate).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1640/2025



Rajesh Khandelwal S/o Late Shri Dwarka Prasad, Aged About 54 Years, R/o A-13, B-1, Kamla Nagar, Meenawala, Sirsi Road, Near 21 Number Bus Stand, P.s. Karni Vihar, Jaipur (Rajasthan) (Petitioner Is Presently Confined In Judicial Custody In Central Jail, Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2184/2025

Sharwan Kumar Godara S/o Shri Birbal Ram Godara, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Of Bajju Khalasa, Tehsil Bajju, Police Station Bajju, District Bikaner. (At Present Confined At Central Jail Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Public Prosecutor.

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2185/2025

Rajendra Kumar Yadav @ Raju S/o Shri Tejpal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Tadawas, Police Station Kaladera, Jaipur Rural, District Jaipur. (Presently Prisoner Central Jail, Ghatgate, Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Public Prosecutor.

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2186/2025

Santosh D/o Shri Gogaram, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Gulsaniyon Ki Dhani, Dhorimanna, Police Station Dhorimanna, Distt. Barmer, Rajasthanat Present Residing At Plot No 9-A, Shobhavato , Ki Dhani, Kasturi Nagar, Police Thana Chaupasani, Housing Board, Jodhpur, Rajasthan. (Accused Petitioner Presently Confined In Central Jail Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2187/2025

Ashok Singh Nathawat S/o Rudaram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o
Deva Ka Bas, Police Station Renwal, District Jaipur Gramin (Raj.)
(At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2776/2025

Indubala D/o Shri Bhagwanaram, Aged About 24 Years, R/o
Village Harnay Police Station Karda, Distt. Sanchoe, Rajasthan.
(Accused Petitioner Presently Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2777/2025

Vikramjeet Vishnoi S/o Shri Sagarram Vishnoi, Aged About 42
Years, R/o Village Mithriya, Tehsil Kolayat, Police Station Bajju,
District Bikaner Rajasthan (Currently In Judicial Custody Central
Jail Ghatgate)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2778/2025

Bhagirath Vishnoi S/o Shri Jaikishan, Aged About 28 Years, R/o
Village Mokhatra, Police Station Karda, District Jalore Rajasthan
(Currently In Judicial Custody Jail Ghatgate)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 3331/2025

Lokesh Sharma S/o Late Rambabu Sharma, Aged About 49



Years, R/o Plot Number 52, Karni Nagar, Agra Road, Dausa, P.s. Kotwali, Dausa, District Dausa. (At Present Accused Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 3877/2025

Tulchharam Kaler S/o Asharam, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Village Rampur P.s. Chhapar, District Churu (Raj.) At Present Tenant Plot No 70, Auric Prime Villa, Bhankrota, P.s. Bhankrota, District Jaipur. (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 3878/2025

Rajendra Kumar Yadav S/o Sh. Dwarka Prasad Yadav, Aged About 55 Years, R/o House No. A-35, Kumawat Colony, Jhotwara, Police Station Jhotwara, Jaipur. (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 3879/2025

Vimla W/o Gopiram Jangu, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Siyago Ki Beri, Aleti, P.s. Dhorimanna, District Barmer, D/o Mohanlal Tetarwal, R/o Shiv Mandir Neri Nadi, P.s. Dhorimanna, District Barmer. (At Present Accused Is Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4271/2025

Gopal @ Gopal Saran S/o Paburam, Aged About 31 Years, R/o



Prawa, P.s. Chitalwana, Distt. Sanchore, Presently R/o Flat No. 602, Hira Shri Apartment, Near Spine City Mall, Mosi, P.s. Mosi, Pune, Maharashtra. (Presently Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4272/2025

Somesh Godara S/o Jagram Godara, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Behind Of Jwala Vihar, Near Jeevan Jyoti Hospital, Sootla Chaupasani, Police Station Pratap Nagar, Jodhpur (Rajasthan) (At Present Accused Petitioner Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4273/2025

Shaitanaram S/o Mohanlal, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village Kravadi, Police Station Jhaab, District Sanchore, Rajasthan Presently Constable No. 2606 Traffic Unit Commissionerate, Jodhpur. (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur, District Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4792/2025

Ramuram Raika Son Of Late Shri Bhopalram Raika, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Village Gangwana, Police Station Rol, District Nagaur, Presently Residing At Flat No. 103, Chitra Nikunj, Brij Colony, Sodala, Jaipur (At Present Lodged In Central Jail Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Its P.p.

-----Respondent



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 5082/2025

Smt Chammi Bai Alias Sammi Alias Samita D/o Aasuram W/o Ganpatlal, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Kabuli, Police Station Dhorimanna, District Barmer, Currently Lalji Ki Doongari, Police Station Chitalwana, District Sachor. (At Presently Confined At Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 5083/2025

Gamaram Alias Ghamaram Khileri S/o Poonmaram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Maalwada, Police Station Chitalwana, District Sanchore, (At Present Confined At Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 5232/2025

Smt. Monika D/o Ramdhan W/o Vikas, R/o Sultanpura, P.s. Nawalgarh, District Jhunjhunu At Present R/o Tarpura, P.s. Dadiya, District Sikar At Present Sub Inspector (Training) Police Line Jhunjhunu (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 5692/2025

Arun Sharma S/o Sanwarmal Sharma, R/o Ward No. 06, Vijay Colony, Opposite Railway Station, Shrimadhampur, P.s. Shrimadhampur, Distt. Neem Ka Thana (Presently Confined In High Security Jail Ajmer)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through P.p.

-----Respondent



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 6048/2025

Anil Kumar Meena @ Sher Singh Meena S/o Gopal Meena, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Dola Ka Bas Kaladera, Tehsile Chomu, Police Station Kaladera, District Jaipur Rural (Presently Accused Petitioner Is Confined In Central Jail Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through P.p.

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 6468/2025

Arjun Kumar Parjapat S/o Shri Rajendra Kumar, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Shubhash Nagar Marg, Kheme Ka Kua, Pal Road, Police Station Shastri Nagar, District Jodhpur Rajasthan. (At Present Confined At Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 6960/2025

Kamlesh Dhaka S/o Shri Mangilal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Dhanji Ki Dhani, Gangasara, Post Achalpur, Police Station Sarwana, District Santhore, Presently Residing At B-106, Ashapurna Empire, Neminagar, Vaishali Nagar, Police Station Vaishali Nagar, Jaipur (Raj.) (At Present Accused Petitioner Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7345/2025

Mahendra Kumar S/o Manchharam Borana, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Odo Ki Gali, Near Gayatri Mandir, Bheenmal, Police Station Bheenmal, District Jalore. (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur, District Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus



State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7565/2025

Omprakash Dhaka S/o Shri Kishnaram, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Pur, Police Station Sanchore, District Sanchore, Rajasthan. (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7566/2025

Bhupendra Saran S/o Paburam Saran, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Parawa, P.s. Chitalwana, Distt. Sanchore (Raj.) (Presently Confined In High Security Jail Ajmer).

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7859/2025

Indra @ Indu Kumari D/o Gangaram, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Gavandi, P.s. Bagoda, Distt. Jalore, Presently R/o Vadanaya, P.s. Bagoda, Distt. Jalore. (Presently Confined In Central Jail Jaipur)

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Trough P.p.

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7931/2025

Ms. Varsha D/o Shri Tejaram Sau, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Sarnau, Police Station Sanchore, District Sanchore, Presently Teacher First Class Government Higher Secondary School, Naukha, Police Station Sursagar, District Jodhpur. (Currently In Judicial Custody Central Jail Ghatgate)

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp



----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8163/2025

Narpatlal S/o Shankraram, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Vadanaya,
P.s. Bagoda, Distt. Jalore. (Presently Confined In Central Jail
Jaipur)

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through P.p.

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8287/2025

Vijendra Kumar Joshi S/o Madanlal Joshi, Aged About 33 Years,
R/o Village Yalsar, Police Station Balara, District Sikar At Present
Trainee Of Sub Inspector Intelligence Training Academy Nehru
Nagar, Jaipur. (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

----Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8291/2025

Madanlal S/o Shri Radhakishan, Aged About 38 Years, R/o
Sarupanian Ki Dhani, Moolaraj Lohawat, Police Station Lohawat,
District Phalodi, Rajasthan Currently Trainee Platoon Commander,
A Company, 3Rd, Battalion, Rac, Bikaner. (Accused Petitioner
Presently Presently Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8295/2025

Sandeep Kumar Lata S/o Kanheyalal, Aged About 42 Years, R/o
Sabalpura, Police Thana Sadar Sikar, District Sikar. Presently
Assistant Accountant First, Treasury And Accounts Department,
Vitta Bhawan, Jaipur. (Presently Accused Petitioner Is Confined In
Central Jail, Jaipur).

----Petitioner

Versus



State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8369/2025

Ramkhiladi Meena S/o Tejram Meena, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Aulwada, Police Station Kundera, District Sawai Madhopur, Presently Reserve Police Line, Karauli (Presently Lodged In Central Jail, Jaipur)

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8498/2025

Paurav Kaler S/o Om Prakash Jat, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Rampur, Dewani, Police Station Chhapar, District Churu, Current Address B 6-185, Sudarshana Nagar, Behind Nagnechi Mata Temple, Police Station Jainarayan Vyas Colony, District Bikaner (Raj.) (Currently In Judicial Custody Central Jail Ghatgate, Jaipur).

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8500/2025

Deepak Rahad @ Monu S/o Late Shri Banwarilal, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Ghanghu, Police Station Sadar Churu, District Churu (Rajasthan) Presently Plot No. 10, Poonia Colony, Police Station Kotawali, District Churu, Rajasthan, (Currently In Judicial Custody Central Jail, Ghatgate, Jaipur).

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8561/2025

Virendra Meena S/o Shri Ashok Kumar Meena, R/o Patti Kalan, Bamanwas, Police Station Bamanwas, Distt. Sawai Madhopur. Presently Address Plot No. 5, Radha Krishna Colony, Jagatpura,



Jaipur (Raj.) (Presently Confined At Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 9031/2025

Hanumanaram S/o Shri Kaushlaram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Bisaraniya, Police Station Dhanau, Distt. Barmer, Rajasthan, Currently Sub Divisional Officer (Sdm), Sub Division, Fatehgarh, Distt. Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. (Accused Petitioner Presently Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 9033/2025

Ramesh Kumar Vishnoi S/o Foosaram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Dhakon Ki Dhani, Pur, Police Station Sanchore, District Jalore, Presently Suspended Senior Teacher, Govt. Senior Secondary School Sankad, Sanchore, Presently Posted Block Education Officer, Office Sanchore. (At Present Confined In Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 9210/2025

Swaroop Chand Meena Son Of Shri Ramkishan @ Kishan Lal, Resident Of Tikrizafran, Police Station Mahwa, District Dausa (Rajasthan) (Presently Prisoner Central Jail Ghatgate, Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through P.p.

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 9983/2025

Ajay Pratap Singh S/o Nadan Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o



Padampura, P.s. Gegal, Dist. Ajmer, At Present 630, Mahadev Nagar, Police Line Ajmer, P.s. Civil Lines, Ajmer, Dist. Ajmer, At Present G-10, Pwd Quarters, Lohakhan, Ajmer, At Present Personal Secy. 2Nd Revenue Board, Ajmer. (At Present Accused Is At Present Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 9984/2025

Kundan Kumar Pandya S/o Late Shri Dinker Pandya, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Brahmin Basti, Taamtiya, Tehsil Saagwada, Police Station Varda, District Dungarpur (Rajasthan) At Present Grade Third Teacher, Government Primary School, Kanyalaghata, Palwada, Dungarpur. (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 10173/2025

Ramniwas Vishnoi S/o Sukhram Vishnoi, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Janguon Ki Dhani, Dungarwa, Ps Bagoda, Distt. Jalour. At Present Posted As Third Grade Teacher, Level-I, Government Primary School, Khatano Ki Dhani, Dungarwa, Panchayat Samiti Bagoda, Distt. Jalour (Rajasthan) (Presently Prisoner At Central Jail, Ghatgate, Jaipur)

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through P.p.

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 10338/2025

Buddhisagar Upadhyay S/o Late Shri Radhakant Upadhyay, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Near Bhairoji Temple, Near Hathaliya Pond, Village Bori, Police Station Garhi, Distt. Banswara, Rajasthan. Presently 1/1, Dhulkot Chauraha, Aayd, Police Station Bhupalpura, Distt. Udaipur, Rajasthan. (Accused Petitioner Presently Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).



-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 10339/2025

Aditya Upadhyay S/o Shri Buddhisagar Upadhyay, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Near Bhairoji Temple, Near Hathaliya Pond, Village Bori, Police Station Garhi, Distt. Banswara, Rajasthan. Presently 1/1, Dhulkot Chauraha, Aayd, Police Station Bhupalpura, Distt. Udaipur, Rajasthan. (Accused Petitioner Presently Confined In Central Jail Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 10340/2025

Purushottam Dadhich S/o Mahaveer Prasad Sharma, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Sagu Chhoti, Post Sagu Kalan, Police Station Khunkhuna, District Deedwana Kuchaman, At Present Under Suspension Assistant Accounts Officer First, Office Of Joint Director, Medical And Health Department, Udaipur. (At Present In Central Jail, Jaipur).

-----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Sudhir Jain, Mr. Prince Pal Singh
Mr. Saurabh Jain, Mr. Parth Vashistha
(in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail
Application No. 197/2025),
Mr. Sudhir Jain, Mr. Prince Pal Singh
Mr. Saurabh Jain in S.B. Criminal
Miscellaneous Bail Application No.
4271/2025 and in S.B. Criminal
Miscellaneous Bail Application No.
7566/2025
Mr. Prince Pal Singh
Mr. Naveen Bishnoi (in S.B. Criminal
Miscellaneous Bail Application No.



339/2025)

Mr. Jitender Choudhary (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application Nos. 408/2025, 1425/2025, 1426/2025, 2185/2025, 2777/2025, 2778/2025, 7931/2025, 8498/2025, 8500/2025, 9210/2025 and 10173/2025

Mr. Madhav Mitra, Senior Advocate with Mr. Veerendra Singh & Ms. Jaya Mitra (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1027/2025)

Mr. V.R. Bajwa, Senior Advocate with Mr. Prince Pal Singh and Mr. Amar Kumar (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1028/2025)

Mr. V.R. Bajwa, Senior Advocate with Mr. Amar Kumar (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4792/2025)

Mr. V.R. Bajwa, Senior Advocate with Mr. Amar Kumar & Mr. Aladeen Khan (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 10340/2025)

Mr. Gajveer Singh Rajawat (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1424/2025)

Mr. Raja Ram, Mr. Gajveer Singh Rajawat, Mr. Sarthak Chobey, Mr. Gaurav Sharma and Ms. Kamini Pareek (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7345/2025)

Mr. Mahendra Shandilya with Mr. Surender Kumar Lamba (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application Nos. 2184/2025, 2187/2025, 3878/2025, 5082/2025, 5083/2025, 6468/2025

Mr. Saurabh Jain with Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sharma & Ms. Aditi (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8561/2025)

Mr. Mahendra Shandilya with Mr. Suresh Khileri and Mr. Surendra Kumar Lamba (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 7565/2025 and 9033/2025)

Mr. Swadeep Singh Hora with Mr. Sahajveer Baweja & Mr. Siddhant Choudhary





(S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 9983/2025)
Ms. Harshita Sharma (S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 9984/2025)
Mr. Vedant Sharma with
Mr. Shivam Sharma (S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 2186/2025, 2776/2025, 4272/2025, 8291/2025, 9031/2025, 10338/2025, 10339/2025)
Mr. Pankaj Gupta (S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 3331/2025)
Mr. Sanjay Gangwar
Ms. Gayatri Sharma (S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 3877/2025)
Mr. Swadeep Singh Hora with
Mr. Sahaj Veer Baweja, Mr. Siddhant Choudhary and Dharmendra Fageriya (S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 3879/2025)
Mr. Aniroodh Mathur with Mr. Krishnaveer Singh & Mr. Naman Yadav (S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4273/2025)
Mr. Dharmendra Fageria (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 5232/2025)
Mr. Vishal Pareek (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 6048/2025)
Mr. Gaurav Jain, Mr. Prashant Khandelwal and Mr. Arpit Gupta (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 6960/2025)
Mr. Manvendra Singh Choudhary (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8287/2025)
Mr. Deepak Chauhan with
Mr. Ashok Choudhary
Mr. Gourav Vyas (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8295/2025)
Mr. Gajendra Singh Shekhawat for
Mr. Ajay Kumar Jain (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 8369/2025)
Mr. Satyam Khandelwal (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 1640/2025)





Mr. Prince Pal Singh with Mr. Naveen Bishnoi (in S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 5692/2025, 7859/2025 and 8163/2025)

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Anurag Sharma, Special PP with Ms. Shreya Hatila & Mr. Anoop Meena Mr. Saleh Mohammed, Dy. SP, SOG



HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR JAIN

Order

BLE

01/09/2025

1. These bail applications have been preferred by different accused persons arrayed in the same FIR No. 10/2024 registered at Special Police Station (SOG), District ATS And SOG, under Sections 419, 420, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 4,5, 6 of Rajasthan Public Examination (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 1992 and 66-D of the Information and Technology Act. Considering that the accused persons are linked to the same case and FIR, their bail applications are being adjudicated by this common order for the sake of convenience, judicial economy, and consistent dispensation of justice.
2. Considered defect(s) in Criminal Misc. Bail Applications Nos. 5083/2025 and 9033/2025, as same is ignored and over-ruled.
3. Learned Senior Advocate and counsels for the parties submitted that the applicants-accused are innocent persons and they were falsely implicated. They further submitted that the offence relating to use of unfair means in Rajasthan Public Examination conducted by RPSC in the year 2021. They further submitted that at the time of commission of offence,



the Rajasthan Public Examination (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred as "Act of 1992") was in force and maximum sentence prescribed was 3 years. They further submitted that it was only in 2022 when the Act was amended by Amendment Act of 2022 but the offence alleged is committed before coming into force of Amendment Act. They further submitted that after several years on unverified complaint, the matter is investigated by SOG without any authority and further SOG has arrested candidate, dummy candidate (person who impersonated on behalf of original candidate), alleged handler, alleged member of gang and conspirator and abettor but there is no evidence on record to show that the candidate in fact has not appeared in the said examination and the dummy candidate has appeared in the examination. They further submitted that there is no evidence to show meeting of mind, common intention and also of conspiracy. They further submitted that money transaction by any UPI is just a normal business transaction and same cannot be treated as transfer of illegal gratification to dummy candidate, handlers and conspirators or members of the Gang. They further submitted that neither RPSC nor police has registered any case after verification of candidature or other material. They also submitted that after investigation, a charge-sheet has been filed and there is long list of witnesses and there is no likely to be concluded soon. They also submitted that the offence is triable by Magistrate First Class and the applicants are entitled to be released on bail.





4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of **Sharwanram @ Sharwan Babal, Gopal @ Gopal Saran S/o Paburam** and **Bhupendra Saran S/o Paburam Saran** submitted that applicant-accused Sharwanram is in custody since 27.03.2024 and time of alleged examination he was in open air camp and is not possible for him to visit Kota. He further submitted that there is no evidence except information under Section 27 of Evidence Act.
5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Gopal @ Gopal Saran S/o Paburam submitted that the allegation upon him is to read and solve the paper to candidates prior to examination and he is shown as site handler and a similarly placed person Suresh is granted bail by Hon'ble Apex Court.
6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Bhupendra Saran S/o Paburam Saran submitted that allegation is upon him to purchase the paper from Anil Kumar and give it to Suresh Dhaka. He submitted that co-accused is already granted bail. He also submitted that these applicants were already granted bail in pending cases. He further referred bail order in case of **Anil Sharma Vs. State of Rajasthan SLP (Criminal) No. 9564/2025** and submitted that on 12.08.2025, Hon'ble Supreme Court has granted bail to similarly placed accused.
7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Jairaj Singh S/o Aasu Singh submitted that the allegation on present applicant is to help the candidates through Bluetooth device and he has been shown as gang member of Bluetooth Cheating Gang. He further submitted that co-accused Ankita Godara, Prabha



Bishnoi, Manish Bishnoi were granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court and case of present applicant is on similar footing. He referred bail order dated 13.05.2025 in SLP (Criminal) No. 5406/2025.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of applicants-accused Naresh Dan Charan S/o Shri Ratan Dan Charan, Rinku Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Naval Kishore Sharma, Shyam Pratap Singh S/o Shri Bhagwan Singh, Rajendra Kumar Yadav @ Raju S/o Shri Tejpal, Vikramjeet Vishnoi S/o Shri Sagarram Vishnoi, Bhagirath Vishnoi S/o Shri Jaikishan, Ms. Varsha D/o Shri Tejaram Sau, Paurav Kaler S/o Om Prakash Jat, Deepak Rahad @ Monu S/o Late Shri Banwarilal, Swaroop Chand Meena Son Of Shri Ramkishan @ Kishan Lal and Ramniwas Vishnoi S/o Sukhram Vishnoi submitted that co-accused Pravin Kumar, Suresh Sharma, Bhagwati, Manju Vishnoi, Harku, Girdhari Ram and Suresh Kumar were granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court and a Co-ordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court and the facts relating to these applicants are squarely covered with the persons already granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court. He further submitted that applicants-accused Naresh Dan Charan S/o Shri Ratan Dan Charan, Rinku Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Naval Kishore Sharma, Shyam Pratap Singh S/o Shri Bhagwan Singh, Rajendra Kumar Yadav @ Raju S/o Shri Tejpal, Vikramjeet Vishnoi S/o Shri Sagarram Vishnoi, Bhagirath Vishnoi S/o Shri Jaikishan, Ms. Varsha D/o Shri Tejaram Sau, Paurav Kaler S/o Om Prakash Jat, Deepak Rahad @ Monu S/o Late Shri Banwarilal, Swaroop Chand Meena Son Of Shri



Ramkishan @ Kishan Lal and Ramniwas Vishnoi S/o Sukhram Vishnoi are in custody for more than one year and they are entitled to seek bail only on ground of period of custody. He further submitted that except information under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act there is no recovery in the matter and evidence is not admissible under the law.

Learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of Harshvardhan Kumar Meena S/o Murari Lal Meena has submitted that applicant-accused is arrayed as an accused only on ground that he is a handler but there is no proof to connect with scam. He further submitted that SOG has framed this applicant-accused without any legal evidence. He also submitted that this applicant-accused was named in three other cases and in all three cases he has been bailed out. He further referred his role and involvement as mentioned in charge-sheet and also the material on record and submitted that present applicant has a good case for bail but despite no evidence he has been behind the bars since 06.03.2024. He further submitted that maximum allegation on present applicant is to assist in alleged crime committed by his wife and his brother in law and both were granted bail. He further referred the evidence collected by SOG and submitted that at one place SOG has mentioned that applicant did not got the paper and in another place mentioned that those three candidates who were helped by present applicant have failed in examination. He also submitted that when his wife and brother-in-law have failed in written examination how can SOG



point out finger upon present applicant. At last, he submitted that in identical cases other accused were granted bail by this Hon'ble Court or by Hon'ble Supreme Court whether they are handler, mediator, inter-mediators or a conspirator.

10. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of Sunil Kumar Beniwal, Ramuram Raika, Purushottam Dadhich has submitted that the allegation on applicant-accused Sunil Kumar Beniwal is that he assisted and abetted the crime so as to assist his sister-in-law Rajeshwari Vishnoi. He further submitted that as per allegation present applicant has entered into a deal to buy paper after payment of ₹15 lacs for his sister-in-law. He further submitted that except information under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act, there is no evidence against the applicant-accused. He further submitted that three previous cases were mentioned by SOG and they were from 2015 to 2017. He also submitted that there is no financial trail to show that present applicant Sunil Kumar has ever received and paid money to anyone to influence the exam procedure. He referred the evidence and submitted that mere assisting in dropping a close relative to an examination centre is not an offence and SOG has unnecessarily arrested the applicant-accused who is in custody since 02.07.2024.

11. Learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of Ramuram Raika has submitted that he is arrayed as an accused as he was member of RPSC but there is no allegation of financial transaction between present applicant and anybody else. He further submitted that at the most the allegation upon present



applicant is misusing his official position in procuring paper from another member of RPSC Babu Lal Katara and providing to his son and daughter of present applicant who were granted bail. He also submitted that mere a fact that present applicant is father of two children who got selected due to availability of paper contrary to Babu Lal Katara is not sufficient to arrest and forward him to face trial. He further referred the evidence collected by SOG and submitted that an information under Section 27 of Evidence Act is not a legal evidence unless there is recovery in pursuant to information or disclosure made by an accused. He also referred the material forwarded by SOG and submitted that without recovery or incriminating evidence against the applicant he cannot be kept behind the bars.

12. Learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of Purushottam Dadhich submitted that present applicant is a Government employee and without any evidence he has been arrayed as an accused. He further submitted that the only allegation upon present applicant is that he assisted and provided paper to a selected candidate Renu Kumari. He further submitted that the allegation of selling question paper @ ₹15 lacs, 4-5 days before the examination in collusion with any other person who is not an accused is not proved from the evidence. He also submitted that present applicant-accused is in custody since 02.06.2025 and a charge-sheet has already been filed against him. He also submitted that meeting or knowing someone is not an offence unless there is a meeting of mind to commit a crime punishable under the law. He referred the judgment in



case of **Ketan Suresh Pawar & Anr. Vs. Yuvraj Sandeepan Sawant & Anr. 2019 (9) JT (SC) 56** and submitted that mere dismissal of anticipatory bail is not a ground to reject a regular bail. He also submitted that if applicant moved a petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. even then same is not a ground to dismiss present application for regular bail.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Manisha Sihag and Mahender Kumar has submitted that the allegation upon Manisha Sihag is for using Bluetooth device during examination held on 13.09.2021. He further submitted that no such Bluetooth device was recovered from applicant and there is no evidence to show that this applicant has used Bluetooth device for solving the paper. He also submits that present applicant is a female who is in custody since 08.06.2024 and similarly placed Ankita Godara was granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Criminal) No. 5406/2025 on 13.05.2025. He also referred material against Mahender Kumar and submitted that the allegation on present applicant is that he prepared a morph photograph by mixing photograph of original candidates and dummy candidates so that dummy candidate may not be identified as dummy candidate at the time of appearance in examination. He further submitted that the allegation on present applicant is that he prepared the photograph on charge of ₹150-200 per photograph and same is neither an exorbitant price nor sufficient to show that he indulge in criminal activity allegedly performed by other accused.



14. Learned counsels appearing on behalf of Sharwan Kumar Godara, Ashok Singh Nathawat, Rajendra Kumar Yadav, Smt Chammi Bai Alias Sammi Alias Samita, Gamaram Alias Ghamaram Khileri, Arjun Kumar Parjapat, Omprakash Dhaka and Ramesh Kumar Vishnoi have submitted that in identical nature of cases similarly placed accused were granted bail, by this Hon'ble Court or by Hon'ble Supreme Court. He further referred order dated 10.01.2025 in bail application No. 227/2025 titled as Daluram Meena Vs. State of Rajasthan and submitted that the maximum punishment for using unfair means is 3 years and the offence charged are triable by Magistrate. He also submitted that without any legal evidence these applicants were forwarded to face trial and same is itself illegal and applicants are entitled for bail.
15. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Sharwan Kumar Godara has submitted that present applicant was a candidate and he engaged Ashok Kumar Godara as a dummy candidate. He further submitted that Ashok Kumar Godara is not arrested till date by SOG and there is no evidence of any financial transaction between present applicant and Ashok Kumar Godara. He also submitted that role and involvement of Sharwan Kumar Godara with any other person is not proved on record and currently he is in custody since 14.04.2024.
16. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Ashok Singh has submitted that allegation on present applicant is for reading paper and there is no allegation other than reading paper. He further submitted that the financial transaction as alleged were



neither proved nor established from material forwarded by SOG. He also submitted that mere information under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act is not sufficient to presume that the applicant-accused has prima facie committed any crime. He also submitted that the pendency of cases are not sufficient to deny bail to applicant-accused.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Rajendra Kumar Yadav submitted that the allegation upon present applicant is to procure and assist his son in getting question paper. He further submitted that there is no record to show financial transaction except disclosure under Section 27 of Evidence Act procuring paper for his own son.
18. Learned counsel appearing for Chammi Bai Alias Sammi Alias Samita has submitted that the allegation on present applicant is appearing as a dummy candidate on behalf of Manju but there is no financial transaction on record to show transfer of any money by Manju to Chammi Bai Alias Sammi Alias Samita. He also submitted that Chammi bai is a female and she is in custody since 06.03.2024.
19. Learned counsel appearing for Gamaram Alias Ghamaram Khileri has submitted that the allegation on present applicant is for paper reading and not more than paper reading. He also submitted that in identical nature of cases Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Hon'ble Court has granted bail to similarly placed accused. He also submitted that four cases were reported against the applicant-accused but list of pending cases is not sufficient to deny bail to any eligible person. He



referred period of custody and submitted that applicant-accused is in custody since 01.07.2024 and there is no legal evidence against applicant-accused to frame a charge.

20. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Arjun Kumar Parjapat has submitted that present applicant is arrayed as an accused only on ground that he facilitated Vijender Kumar and arranged meeting with paper leak gang. He also referred the material on record and submitted that any financial transaction by present applicant who is neither a candidate nor a handler is a business transaction and same cannot be treated as payment of money to influence public examination process. He also referred two cases registered against present applicant and submitted that both of them are not related to paper leak.
21. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of applicant-accused Omprakash Dhaka has submitted that the allegation on present applicant is to work as a handler and allegedly helping 7 candidates to procure solved papers before the examination from handlers of Jagdish and Pankaj Vishnoi. He also submitted that except an information under Section 27 of Evidence Act there is no evidence to show involvement, as no recovery is effected from the applicant. He also submitted that the financial transactions are not a piece of evidence unless financial transactions establishes a link with the crime. He also submitted that 4 other cases were registered against the applicant and he has secured acquittal in one case. He also submitted that applicant-accused is in custody since 02.07.2024. He further referred order dated 23.05.2025



passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court and submitted that Suresh Sahu having identical nature of allegation was granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court. He also referred order dated 02.06.2025 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court whereby Suresh was also granted bail.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Ramesh Kumar Vishnoi has submitted that the allegation upon present applicant is arranging dummy candidate for two other candidates and there is no evidence except information under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act. He further submitted that mere conspiracy or abetment is not enough unless there is any evidence to show that the applicant-accused has meeting of mind. He also submitted that mere forwarding the name of present applicant after arresting him is not sufficient even to frame a charge. He also submitted that applicant-accused is in custody since 02.05.2025 and three cases were named against him but pendency of cases is not sufficient to deny applicant-accused to grant bail. He further submitted that the alleged dummy candidate Omprakash and Sangeeta are not arrested till date by SOG and this fact is not on record from any evidence that applicant-accused has assisted candidate Virender and Samita Kumari.

23. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of applicant-accused Rajesh Khandelwal has submitted that applicant-accused is in custody since 04.03.2024 and he is entitled to be released on bail only on ground of custody. He further submitted that applicant-accused was Centre Superintendent and there is no



other criminal antecedents against the applicant-accused. He further submitted that the only allegation on present applicant is that he facilitated and appointed Mr. Unik Bhambhu (who leaked the paper and shared on Whatsapp before start of exam from centre) as an invigilator and In-charge of distribution of paper. He further submitted that there is no evidence that applicant-accused was part of any paper leak Gang or having connection with any member of any Gang who received any gratification from anyone. He also referred order dated 27.02.2025 in bail application No. 16164/2024 Shivratn Mot Vs. State of Rajasthan and submitted that in identical facts, a Co-ordinate bench has granted bail to the applicant-accused.

24. Learned counsels appearing for applicants- Santosh D/o Shri Gogaram, Indubala, Somesh Godara, Madan Lal, Hanumanaram, Buddhisagar Upadhyay and Aditya Upadhyay submitted that in identical nature of cases Manju Vishnoi, Bhagwati Vishnoi, Ankita Godara, Vijender Kumar, Suresh Kumar, Ritu Sharma, Anil Sankhla & Ors., GirdhariRam were granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court and he placed on record orders passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Criminal) filed by accused. All these orders were perused by us.
25. Learned counsel for applicant Santosh and Indu Bala has submitted that both are females and the allegation upon them is that they were candidates in said examination but they have not appeared as a candidate instead of appearing they have engaged a dummy candidate. He further submitted that



allegation on record shows that Santosh and Chammi Bai (dummy candidates) are good friends and only because she is friend of Santosh she appeared as dummy candidate on behalf of Santosh and her sister Manju. He further submitted that there is no financial transaction between them and similarly placed candidate Bhagwati Vishnoi was granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court. He also submitted that applicant-accused Santosh is in custody since 02.10.2024.

26. Learned counsel for applicant further referred case of Indu Bala and submitted that the allegation is appearing in examination through her niece Varsha but there is no financial transactions between Indubala and Varsha. He also submitted that the SOG has alleged that the applicant-accused has procured a paper but there is no evidence to show that the paper is procured after payment of ₹15 lacs.
27. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Somesh Godara has submitted that he is in custody since 05.09.2024 and two cases were shown against him. He also submitted that SOG has termed him as a mediator who was working in a school and facilitated paper leak gang. He also submitted that in identical nature of cases Dinesh is granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court. He also submitted that there is no evidence to show that applicant-accused has sent any question paper to anyone through whatsapp. He further submitted that there is no legal evidence against him.
28. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Madan Lal has submitted that he was a candidate and he has not appeared in



said examination rather engaged Ashok Kumar Godara to sit in his place. He also submitted that there is no financial transaction on record to show that applicant-accused has paid money to engage Ashok Kumar as dummy candidate. The applicant-accused is in custody since 20.04.2025.

9. Learned counsel appearing for Hanumanaram has submitted that the allegation on present applicant is to appear as dummy candidate in place of Ramvilas Vishnoi and Narpat Lal and submitted that present applicant is a RAS Officer and posted as SDM. There is no evidence or financial trail between Ramvilas Vishnoi and Narpat Lal and present applicant. He submitted that ultimately Ramvilas Vishnoi and Narpat Lal were not selected as Sub-Inspector though they have passed written examination. He further submitted that SOG has not collected any evidence to implicate present applicant who is in custody since 09.04.2025. He also submitted that Girdhari Ram is granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court and case of Hanumana Ram is squarely covered by bail order passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court.

30. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Buddhisagar Upadhyay and Aditya Upadhyay has submitted that both are father and son and allegation upon them is that Buddhisagar Upadhyay has provided photocopy of handwritten questions and answers of paper set to his son Aditya. He further submitted that there is no financial transaction between Buddhisagar Upadhyay and Aditya Upadhyay and with anybody else. He also submitted that in identical nature of case Rajendra @ Raju, Abhishek



Vishnoi, Surender Kumar were granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court. He also submitted that Buddhisagar is known to Kundan Kumar Pandya and Buddhisagar Upadhyay has allegedly procured paper from Kundan Kumar but there is no evidence to show that Buddhisagar Upadhyay has procured paper from Kundan Kumar. He referred the information under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act and submitted that such information is not admissible in evidence. He also referred evidence under Section 27 of Evidence Act and submitted that there is no evidence of recovery.

31. Learned counsel appearing for Lokesh Sharma has submitted that the allegation on present applicant is that he was in contact of Rinku since he was a student of coaching centre run by wife of present applicant. He further submitted that alleged conversation between Rinku Sharma and present applicant, whereby wherein Rinku Sharma suggested present applicant to refer students who want sure selection in Government job and on basis of such information present applicant has allegedly referred Deepender and Ramroop, were selected. He further submitted that there is a bank transaction of 2020 with Rinku but same is way before the examination held on 13.09.2021 and same cannot be connected with alleged gratification for selection of Deepender and Ramroop. He also submitted that there is no evidence to connect any transaction between Lokesh and Rinku and the call details clearly indicate that same does not connect with examination held on 13.09.2021 and call details of 16 months is not sufficient to



get applicant-accused with alleged crime. He further submitted that the SOG has not submitted any evidence on connection of Deepender and Ramroop with present applicant and unless there is a transaction or communication present applicant cannot be arrayed as an accused. He further submitted that except the statement under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act there is no evidence to show involvement of present applicant.

32. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of applicant-accused Tulchharam kaler submitted that he is innocent person and he is working as teacher in coaching but he is not involved in any of the paper leak or Bluetooth Gang. He further submitted that the allegation upon present applicant is use of Blueetooth device for the purpose of cheating. He also submitted that there is no evidence to show that present applicant has ever used Bluetooth device for the purpose of cheating in public examination. He further submitted that SOG has shown 15 cases against present applicant but all were false and present applicant has portrayed as one of the kingpin whereas there is no evidence against the applicant to forward him for trial.

33. Learned counsel appearing for Vimla, Monika and Arun Sharma submitted that these applicants are not only falsely implicated but their case is identical with those who were already granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court or by this Hon'ble Court. He further referred judgment in case of **Shahrukh @ Banti Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh (Criminal Appeal No.1289/2023)** arising out of SLP criminal No. 1830/2023 and submitted that parity in that sense could not be



understood in a hyper-technical way to mean the number of years, months, days and hours that the co-accused spent for deciding whether another co-accused is released on bail, the only question that falls for consideration is as to whether the continued detention of one accused was necessary despite the release of the co-accused.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Vimla submits that she is a female and her husband who was candidate in said examination were already released on bail. He further submits that the only allegation upon present applicant is that alleged mastermind of paper leak Jagdish is known to her and she facilitated her husband, Gopiram and Shrawan Kumar to procure solved papers from Jagdish Vishnoi. He also submitted that except an information under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act and there is no evidence against her and she is in custody since 13.12.2024.
35. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Monika has submitted that applicant-accused is an unfortunate female who was sent to behind the bars despite being pregnant on date of arrest. He submitted that present applicant-accused has given birth to a baby on 04.08.2025 and she is entitled for bail only on ground that he is having a baby to take care. He referred guidelines laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **R.D. Upadhyay Vs. State of AP (2007) 15 SCC 37** and submitted that dismissal of bail by Trial Court is contrary to the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court. He also referred the material available on record against the applicant and



submitted that she was alleged that being a candidate she was helped in cheating by Bluetooth and she is in connect with Blueetooth gang and ultimately she got selected. He further submitted that the case of present applicant is identical with Ankita Godara, Suresh Sahu, Prabha, Shoba Raika and Draupdi Sihag who were granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court.

36. Learned counsel for applicant further referred the case of Ajay Pratap Singh and submitted that applicant-accused was a candiate and the allegation upon him is that his father Nadan Singh was working as driver with Babu Lal Katara (RPSC Member) and with assistance of nephew of Babu Lal Katara, Vijay Kumar present applicant has read the paper and ultimately he cleared written examination but not finally selected. He further submitted that there is no evidence on record to establish that this applicant has ever read paper and answers before appearing as candidate in examination. He also referred merits of present applicant and submitted that on his own he cleared Direct Joint Recruit Examination for Stenographers in 2018 and presently he has been posted as Stenographer in Revenue Board, Ajmer. He further submitted that case of present applicant is in parity with Ankita Godara, Suresh Sahu, Prabha and Shobha who were granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court. He further referred the case of Neeraj Kumar who was granted bail on 22.11.2024 in bail application No. 13393/2024 even before filing of charge-sheet and



submitted that on ground of parity present appellant is entitled for bail.

37. Learned counsel appearing for Shaitanaram submitted that the allegation on present applicant is that an unknown person has shown the leaked paper to Ajay Vishnoi just before the examination and on basis of statement of Ajay Vishnoi present applicant was arrested by SOG on the ground that Ajay Vishnoi has paid ₹5 lacs out of 15 lacs to present applicant to arrange paper through Vishnu. He also submitted that there is no financial trail or transaction on record to show involvement of present applicant with Ajay Vishnoi or Vishnu and he submitted that Ajay Vishnoi has been granted bail on 12.12.2024 and case of present applicant is on better footing than Ajay. He also submitted that applicant is in custody since 22.08.2024. He also referred material on record and submitted that except disclosure statement under Section 27 of Evidence Act there is no evidence on record. He further submitted that a statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. was recorded but same is just a hearsay evidence. He further submitted that in identical nature of case Suresh Sahu has been granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court.
38. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of applicant accused Anil Kumar Meena @ Sher Singh Meena submitted that present applicant has granted bail in FIR No. 540/2020 where the allegations were for receiving the question paper on Whatsapp and forwarding to others. He submitted that in identical nature of case relating to Act of 1992 present applicant was already



released on bail by Co-ordinate Bench on 09.11.2023. He also submitted that present applicant-accused is granted bail in other cases as well. He further submitted that present applicant has no connection with any of the candidate or dummy candidate.

39. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Kamlesh Dhaka has submitted that the allegation on present applicant is to co-ordinate between accused Suresh Sahu and others. He further submitted that Suresh Sahu has already granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court and case of present applicant is on far better footings than Suresh Sahu. He also submitted that as per allegation appellant-accused has procured paper for his own brothers and there is no financial transaction or trail to show involvement of present applicant with any other person. He also submitted that applicant-accused is in custody since 19.02.2025.

40. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of appellants accused Arun Sharma, Indra and Narpatlal has submitted that these applicants are innocent persons and they were falsely implicated by SOG. He further referred order dated in case of **Girdhariram Vs. State of Rajsthan** (Hon'ble Supreme Court) and submitted that the case of present appellant is identical with other co-accused who were granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court.

41. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Arun Sharma has submitted that he is in custody since 11.07.2024 and allegation upon him is to read and solve the paper to



candidates prior to examination of Sub-Inspector, 2021 with help of Anil Kumar at Jodhpur. He also submitted that three criminal cases were shown against him and applicant is on bail in all three cases. He also submitted that there is no recovery from the present applicant. He referred order dated 23.05.2024 passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court in Bail Application No. 5867/2024 wherein the applicant- accused is granted bail. He also referred order dated 16.06.2025 in bail application No. 15927/2023 by a Coordinate Bench and submitted that applicant accused was granted bail in identical nature of case.

42. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Indra @ Indra Kumari submitted that allegation on present applicant applicant-accused is that she has appeared as dummy candidate on behalf of candidate, Harku who cleared the examination. He further submitted that a Co-ordinate Bench has already granted bail to Harku on 18.07.2025. He also submitted that the case of present applicant is squarely covered with case of Girdhari Ram who was granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court.
43. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Narpat Lal has submitted that applicant-accused was a candidate and he engaged Hanumanaram (RAS) to appear as a dummy candidate on his behalf. He submitted that similarly placed Harku, Manju Vishnoi and Bhagwati Vishnoi were already granted bail by this Court and there is no criminal antecedents against the present applicant.



44. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Vijender Kumar Joshi has submitted that applicant accused has allegedly purchased a paper by making payment of ₹10,00,000, but there is no trial or financial transaction to show that ₹10 lakhs is paid by him. He also submitted that present applicant is in custody since 06.06.2025 and he was a candidate, but having no call details with other accused in the case. He further submitted that he is not having any connection with anybody and applicant-accused arrayed as an accused only on suspicion and information by other co-accused.

45. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Sandeep Kumar Lata has submitted that this applicant-accused is neither named in FIR nor there is any direct evidence to show involvement of present applicant. He further submitted that the allegation on present applicant is that he is having connection with Kundan Kumar Pandya, Purushottam Dadhich and with assistance of both have procured paper from Babu Lal Katara. He submitted that present applicant has no financial trail with anyone and there is no evidence to show that he has forwarded the paper to anyone. He further submitted there is no evidence to show that applicant accused was in possession of leaked paper at any time before the examination and forwarded to anyone before the examination. He also submitted that there is no evidence except information under section 27 of Indian evidence act and same is not a legal evidence against the applicant-accused.



46. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Ram Khiladi Meena has submitted that the allegation on present applicant is that his father contacted Ramavtar to appear as a dummy candidate on behalf of present applicant Ram Khiladi but SOG has not found out any whereabouts of Ram Avatar. He also submitted that father of present applicant expired two years before the FIR, and there is no connect or link evidence to show that his father has ever contacted Ramavtar to appear as a dummy candidate on behalf of accused Ram Khiladi. He further submitted that accused Harku, Manju and Bhagwati were granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court and case of present applicant is identical in nature. He also referred discharge ticket of her wife and he submitted that at the time of arrest she was pregnant and she recently gave birth to a baby on 11.08.2025. He also submitted that without any evidence present applicant accused is arrayed as an accused by SOG.
47. Learned counsel for applicant Virendra Meena submitted that the allegation on present applicant is not to appear in said examination and he engaged Om Prakash as dummy candidate. He submitted that there is no connection between present applicant and Om Prakash to show any financial trail or CDR. He also submitted that applicant-accused is in custody since 20.03.2025 and charge-sheet has already been filed.
48. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Kundan Kumar Pandya has submitted that present applicant is allegedly shown as an associate of Babulal Katara, but there is no material to connect present applicant with Babulal Katara. He further submitted



that material collected by SOG clearly indicate that present applicant is a Government servant and in course of performing duties, if he came to know or meet someone then it is not an offence. He further submitted that the allegation on present applicant is to help and assist his own daughter Ridhi Pandya, nephew Naitik Pandya and niece Neha Pandya. He further submits that there is no evidence to show that present applicant has procured a paper and answer sheet to help close relatives of present applicant. He further submitted that there is no evidence on record to show that present applicant has any connection with anyone in relation to alleged act. He further submitted that only on basis of surmises and conjunctures, present applicant was arrayed as an accused.

49. Learned Senior Advocate, Mr. V.R. Bajwa has submitted bail order dated 12.08.2025 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in respect of bail granted to Anil Sankhla, Jagdish Siyag, Dinesh, Chetan Singh Meena, Rajaram @ Raju Matrix, Dinesh Singh Chouhan. He also placed reliance on order of Suresh Sahu, Girdhari Ram, Ankita Godara, Bhagwati Bishnoi, Prabha Bishnoi, Harku and Shivratan Mot.
50. On the contrary, Learned Special Public Prosecutor Mr. Anurag Sharma has filed a detailed report on behalf of SOG indicating role and involvement of each of the applicant whose bail is considered by this Court. He further submitted that all efforts were made by them to place on record details relating to act committed by these applicants along with details of evidence



collected against them and further period of custody and their criminal antecedents.

51. Learned Special Public Prosecutor has submitted that one RPSC Member Babu Lal Katara is Kingpin of the entire racket and due to personal monetary gains, he not only acted against the interest of RPSC and Government but also betrayed to oath of office. He further submitted that besides paper leak and selling question paper, there are evidence of mass scale cheating in solving paper were also found with help of an organized network. He submitted that by adopting technology (Bluetooth) and with connivance of examination centres, the operators and handler have helped many candidates and ultimately some of them were successful in written examination. He further referred the evidence and submitted that there is a financial trail and transaction between these persons and details are placed on record and also in case diary available for perusal for Hon'ble Court. He also submitted that CDR of previous two years were procured by SOG to show connection and connivance between the accused for taking advantage in the said examination. He also submitted that there was a mass scale cheating by using bluetooth in said examination but whatever is possible the Investigating Agency has tried to procure the evidence. He candidly admitted that despite efforts the agency could not procure or recover from every candidate but he submitted that the truthfulness and correctness of the evidence is subject-matter of trial and same can be considered at the time of trial.





52. Learned Special Public Prosecutor has placed reliance upon FSL Report in respect of original candidate and also of dummy candidate and submitted that FSL Report clearly indicate that the original candidate has not appeared as a candidate in the Examination and the handwriting opinion given by an expert clearly indicate that dummy candidate has appeared on behalf of original candidate. He further submitted that these FSL reports are admissible under the law and SOG will exhibit and prove them before the Trial Court. He also referred communication and link between the individuals in procuring paper from Babu Lal Katara and further selling on financial gains and submitted that the paper leak is evident from material collected by SOG and it clearly indicate that the paper of SI Recruitment Examination, 2021 was available on payment of ₹5 to 20 lacs and purchased by several candidates through handlers or middleman. He also referred the case of Bluetooth Gang and submitted that if these persons were granted bail then they will again engage in same nature of case and it will be prejudicial to the interest of the society.

53. Learned Special PP has specifically referred the name of Naresh Dan Charan, Rinku Kumar, Rajendra Kumar Yadav @ Raju, Ashok Singh Nathawat, Tulcharam Kaler, Gopal, Somesh Godara, Gammaram, Anil Kumar @ Sher Singh, Om Prakash Dhaka, Bhupender Saran, Paurav Kaler and Kundan Kumar Pandya and submitted that these applicants have played a vital role in paper leak, cheating and in forwarding the material on whatsapp after procuring monetary benefits. He



also referred the case of RPSC Member Ramuram Raika and submitted that he misused his position as RPSC Member and procured paper from Babu Lal Katara and shared with his son and daughter. He also submitted that he gave a speech wherein he admitted that paper is procured by him to help his son and daughter. He also referred role and involvement of other persons and submitted that despite hercules efforts by Investigating Agency they have submitted entire detail to help this Hon'ble Court in disposal of these 53 cases. He further placed reliance upon judgment in case of **State of Rajsthan Vs. Inderraj Singh 2025 INSC 341** wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court has allowed the appeal of State and cancelled the bail of Inderraj and Salman, who were granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court. He submitted that applicants-accused have compromised the sanctity of Public Recruitment Examination conducted by RPSC and it is a case of very serious nature which impacts the society at large. He also referred material on record in opposing bail of all candidates and submitted that details are filed on record.

54. Heard learned Senior Advocates, learned counsels and learned Special Public Prosecutor appeared on behalf of their respective parties. Also perused the material placed on record along with report of SOG and submitted in Court along with details as submitted by them.
55. Though, we have made all efforts to go through the material available on record particularly details submitted in support of bail application and also by SOG. The matter pertains to paper




leak and mass scale cheating in organized manner with help and connivance of individuals involved in the system. FIR No. 10/2024 was registered at PS SOG under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477, 477-A, 408, 409, 201, 109 read with Section 34, 120-B IPC and Sections 3, 4, 5 read with Section 6 of Rajasthan Public Examination (Prevention of Unfair Means), 1992 and Section 66-D of Information and Technology Act, 2000. Total 53 accused are before us and we have considered their individual cases as referred and submitted on their behalf by their counsels.

56. On the basis of details submitted to this Court we have summarized details of each case as under:

"DETAILS OF CASE, DATE OF ARREST, ROLE AND CRIMINAL ANTECEDENTS OF APPLICANT(S), IF ANY

Item No.	Case Details CRLMB Nos.	Date of Arrest	Role Assigned by SOG	Criminal Antecedents
1	197/2025 Sharwanram	27.03.2024	Paper leak Gang-leaked the paper and gave it to the students.	1 Case no. 103/2001 under sections 147, 149, 341, 323 IPC. 2 Case no. 174/2003 under sections 341,323/34 IPC. 3 Case no. 13/2004 under sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 307, 302, 120B IPC. 4 Case no. 431/2007 under sections 341, 323,324/34 IPC. 5 Case no. 82/2010 under sections 379, 420/34 IPC. 6 Case no. 4/2011 under sections 147, 148, 323, 307, 365, 302/149, 201, 120B IPC. 7 Case no. 6/2011 under sections 8/15,18 NDPS Act. 8 Case no. 34/2011 under sections 332, 353, 307 IPC and 3/25 Arms Act. 9 Case no. 187/2011 and



				61/2014 under sections 8/15, 29 NDPS Act.
2	339/2025 Jairaj Singh	03.04.2024	Bluetooth- used Bluetooth device and got selected	None.
3	408/2025 Naresh Dan	02.06.2024	Paper Leak Gang- solved the paper in Hindi language.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 331/2021 under sections 420, 417, 188 120B IPC and 4, 6, 6A Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 360/2021 under sections 420, 409, 115, 120B IPC and 4/6, 5/6, 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act and 66D IT Act. Case no 106/2023 under sections 420, 120B IPC.
4	1027/2025 Harshwardhan Kumar Meena	06.03.2024	Paper leak gang- leaked the paper, solved it and procured money for the same.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no 01/2011 under sections 420, 120B IPC. Case no. 540/2020 and 19/2022 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 4/6 of Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 08/2024 under sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 42/2024 under section 419, 420, 467, 120B IPC and 3, 7, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
5	1028/2025 Sunil Kumar Beniwal	02.07.2024	Paper Leak Gang- distributed solved paper for 15 lakh rupees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 188/2015 and 243/2015 under sections 420, 120B and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 113/2017 under sections 420 IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
6	1424/2025 Manisha Siyag	08.06.2024	Bluetooth- used Bluetooth device and got selected	None.
7	1425/2025 Rinku Kumar Sharma	19.07.2024	Paper Leak Gang- Handler of Harshwardhan Meena.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 540/2020 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 4/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
8	1426/2025 Shyam Pratap Singh	14.04.2024	Dummy Candidate User- used dummy candidate Ashok Kumar Godara who has	None.




			absconded.	
9	1640/2025 Rajesh Khandelwal	04.03.2024	Paper Leak Gang- paper leak for 10 lakh rupees, he put Uniq Bhambu on duty who hid in strong room where he stole the exam paper and sent the same via WhatsApp to his handlers.	None.
	184/2025 hrawan umar Godara	14.04.2024	Dummy Candidate User- used dummy candidate Ashok Kumar Godara who has absconded.	None.
11	2185/2025 Rajendra Kumar Yadav @ Raju	06.03.2024	Paper Leak Gang- showed the solved paper to an unknown candidate on 14.09.2021 and read the solved paper from an unknown handler on 15.09.2021, gave the exam and got selected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case no. 540/2020 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 4/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 19/2022 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 4/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
12	2186/2025 Santosh	02.10.2024	Dummy Candidate User- used dummy candidate Chammibai and did not get selected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case no. 540/2020 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 4/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 227/2022 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6, 6A Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 19/2022 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 4/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
13	2187/2025 Ashok Singh Nathawat	16.03.2024	Procured the leaked paper from Harshwardhan Meena and sold the paper for 13 lakhs.	None.
14	2776/2025 Indubala	12.03.2024	Dummy Candidate User- used dummy candidate Varsha in her place.	None.
15	2777/2025 Vikramjeet Vishnoi	14.04.2024	Dummy Candidate User- used dummy candidate Girdhariram in his	None.



			place.	
16	2778/2025 Bhagirath	07.02.2025	Student- Read the solved paper from Gopal Sahran and got selected.	None.
17	3331/2025 Lokesh Sharma	13.12.2024	Paper Leak Gang- Sent the paper to handler, Rinku Kumar Sharma.	None.
	877/2025 ulcharam aler	09.06.2024	Bluetooth- leaked paper along with his nephew to students and provided Bluetooth to students who got selected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Case no. 43/1993 under section 365, 342, 394 IPC.• Case no. 02/2010 under section 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC.• Case no. 142/2014 under section 420, 120B IPC and 5/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act and 12 IT Act.• Case no. 57/2014 under sections 409, 420, 120B IPC 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.• Case no. 262/2021 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.• Case no. 251/2021 under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 66B IT Act.• Case no. 226/2021 under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.• Case no. 292/2021 under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 66 IT Act.• Case no. 427/2021 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.• Case no. 289/2021 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.• Case no. 165/2023, 167/2023 and 235/2023 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 2(c)(1)(2), 3/10, 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.• Case no 66/2024 under






			 <p>सत्यमेव जयते</p>	<p>sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no 39/2024 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 4, 5, 6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
	878/2025 Ajendra Kumar Yadav	06.03.2024	<p>Paper Leak Gang-arranged meeting between Jagdish Bishnoi and Rajesh Khandelwal. Leaked solved paper through WhatsApp for his son.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 540/2020 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 4/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
20	3879/2025 Vimla Vishnoi	13.12.2024	<p>Paper Leak Gang-leaked solved paper for her husband.</p>	None.
21	4271/2025 Gopal @ Gopal Saran	28.09.2024	<p>Paper leak Gang-leaked solved paper before the exam date for hefty amount.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 14/2021 under sections 379, 285, 120B IPC and 15(1)(2)(3)(4), 16 PMP Act and 3, 4 Explosives Act and 3 PDPP Act. Case no. 227/2022 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6, 6A, Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 647/2022 under sections 420, 406, 468, 471, 120B IPC. Case no. 155/2022 under sections 384, 388 IPC.
22	4272/2025 Somesh Godara	05.09.2024	<p>School Member-son of school principal who leaked paper to students who got selected.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 100/2024 and 101/2024 u/s 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
23	4273/2025 Shaitanaram	12.08.2024	<p>Paper Leak Gang-leaked solved paper for student for 15 lakh rupees.</p>	None.
24	4792/2025 Ramuram Raika	01.09.2024	<p>RPSC Member-took paper from colleague RPSC Member for his children and they got selected.</p>	None.
25	5082/2025 Chammibai	02.07.2024	<p>Dummy Candidate-gave exam in place of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 166/2017 under sections 418, 419, 420, 465, 468, 471,



			Manju and Santosh Vishnoi and one got selected.	120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 494/2021 under sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 62/2024 under sections 419, 420, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
	083/2025 ihamaram	11.07.2024	Paper Leak Gang-took 20 lakhs from Bhupender Saharan for solved paper leak.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 188/2015 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 06/2015 under sections 420, 467, 468, 201, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 5, 6, 6A Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 243/2015 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 227/2022 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6, 6A Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
27	5232/2025 Monika	18.03.2025	Bluetooth- used Bluetooth device and got selected	None.
28	5692/2025 Arun Kumar Sharma	11.07.2024	Paper Leak Gang-handler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 227/2022 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6, 6A Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 124.2021 under sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC.
29	6048/2025 Anil Kumar Meena	16.04.2024	Paper Leak Gang-procured paper for 15 lakhs and sold it for 25 lakhs to Bhupender Saharan and for 10 lakh to Vinod Rewar.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 540/2020 under sections 420 IPC and 4/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 227/2022 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 3, 6, 6A Rajasthan Public Examination Act, 1992 and 3, 6, 9/10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act, 2022. Case no. 747/2022 under sections 419, 420, 467, 201, 120B IPC and



				<p>3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act, 2022 and 1(2), 2(2), 2(3), 2(7), 3(1)(c), 3(2), 5(1), 5(1)(c), 5(1)(d), 5(2), 5(4), 9 Official Secrets Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 19/2022 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 4/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 18/2025 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 2(c)(ii), 3, 4, 6, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
30	6468/2025 Arjun Kumar Prajapat	05.09.2024	School Member- he helped the student Bijender Kumar in cheating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 91/2018 u/s 341, 323, 147/149 IPC. Case no. 115/2018 u/s 3/7 EC Act and 407, 411 IPC.
31	6960/2025 Kamlesh Dhaka	19.02.2025	Paper Leak Gang- taught the solved leaked paper to the students along with his brother.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 227/2022 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6, 6A, Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 136/2022 u/s 419, 420, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
32	7345/2025 Mahender Kumar	14.04.2025	Mixed the photo of Narpal Lal and Hanuman Ram because of which dummy candidate could give exam.	None.
33	7565/2025 Om Prakash Dhaka	02.07.2024	Paper Leak Gang- distributed the solved paper to students through handler.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 2/2010 under sections 353, 332 IPC. Case no. 6/2015 under sections 420, 467, 468, 201, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 5/6, 6A Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 243/2015 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. Case no. 188/2015 420, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
34	7566/2025 Bhupender Saran	16.03.2024	Paper Leak Gang- Procured the solved paper for 25 lakhs and sold it to others through handlers for more	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 335/2010 and 318/2021 under sections 4,5,6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act and 120B IPC. Case no. 540/2020



			money.	<p>under sections 420 IPC and 4,6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case no. 136/2022 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 227/2022 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 3, 6, 6A, 9/10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 747/2022 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC 3, 4, 6, 6A, 9, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 647/2022 and 1289/2022 under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC. • Case no. 556/2022 under sections 419, 420 IPC and 3, 4, 6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 19/2020 under section 420, 120B IPC and 4/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 607/2011 under sections 419, 420 IPC and 3,4,5,6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 18/2025 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 2(c)(ii), 3, 4, 6, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
35	7859/2025 Indra Kumari	06.04.2025	Dummy Candidate- gave exam in place of Harku who got selected.	None.
36	7931/2025 Varsha Kumari	06.10.2024	Dummy Candidate- gave exam in place of Indubala and Bhagwati who got selected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case no. 613/2021 u/s 419. 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
37	8163/2025 Narpat Lal Vishnoi	05.04.2025	Dummy Candidate Accessibility- Placed his wife in place of Harku and she got selected. Got dummy candidate in place	None.



			of himself.	
38	8287/2025 Vijendra Kumar Joshi	06.06.2025	Student- Procured paper from Sandeep Kumar Lata for 10 lakhs and got selected.	None.
39	8291/2025 Madanlal	20.04.2025	Dummy Candidate User- used dummy candidate Ashok Kumar Godara who has absconded.	None.
	295/2025 Sandeep Kumar Lata	04.07.2025	Paper Leak Gang- got paper leaked through known person of RPSC Member and gave hefty amount of money for the same.	None.
41	8369/2025 Ram Khiladi Meena	21.03.2025	Dummy Candidate User- used dummy candidate in his place.	None.
42	8498/2025 Paurav Kaler	31.05.2024	Bluetooth- received leaked paper from school and got it solved by his solver and provided Bluetooth devices and aided students who got selected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case no. 251/2021 and 292/2021 under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 66B IT Act. • Case no. 57/2014 under sections 420, 109, 120B IPC and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 142/14 under sections 420, 120B IPC and 5/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 262/2021 under sections 420, 120B and 3/6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 66/2024 under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act. • Case no. 39/2024 under sections 419, 420, 120B IPC and 4, 5, 6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act and 66 IT Act. • Case no. 09/2025 under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6, 2(c)(ii), 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
43	8500/2025 Deepak Rahad	24.12.2024	Paper Leak Gang- showed the solved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case no. 287/2012 under sections 341, 323,



			paper to his sister-in-law and a student.	354 IPC.
44	8561/2025 Virendra Meena	20.03.2025	Dummy Candidate user- Used dummy candidate Om Prakash Vishnoi in his place who has absconded.	None.
	031/2025 lanumanara n	10.04.2025	Dummy Candidate- Suspended RAS who gave exam in place of Narpat Lal and Ram Niwas Vishnoi.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 85/2024 under sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
46	9033/2025 Ramesh Kumar Vishnoi	02.05.2025	Dummy Candidate Accessibility- took 18 lakhs and made available dummy candidate for Om Prakash Bishnoi who got selected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 494/2021 under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC. Case no. 216/2021 under sections 419, 420, 384, 120B IPC. Case no. 11/2025 under sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
47	9210/2025 Swaroop Chand Meena	10.03.2025	Paper Leak Gang- arranged the solved leaked paper from Harshwardhan Meena for his son.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 42/2024 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 7, 10 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
48	9983/2025 Ajay Pratap Singh	18.07.2025	Student- got the leaked paper but failed the physical exam.	None.
49	9984/2025 Kundan Kumar Pandya	05.06.2025	RPSC Connection- took paper from RPSC Member and gave it to handlers and family members who got selected.	None.
50	10173/2025 Ram Niwas Vishnoi	10.04.2025	Dummy Candidate User- suspended third grade teacher who used dummy candidate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case no. 85/2024 under sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 3, 4, 6 Rajasthan Public Examination Act.
51	10338/2025 Budhisagar Upadhyay	14.06.2025	RPSC Connection- procured paper from RPSC member for his son who got selected.	None.
52	10339/2025 Aditya Upadhyay	13.06.2025	Student- father procured the leaked paper and son got selected.	None.
53	10340/2025	02.06.2025	RPSC Connection-	None.



	Purshottam Dadhich		he was accomplice of Sandeep Kumar Latha and distributed paper to his connections and majority of them got selected but 2 failed in physical exam.	
--	--------------------	--	--	--



7. If there is any discrepancy in date of arrest or role then same is just for purpose to mention in the order. The details as submitted by SOG contained in bulky record and we are only reproducing by way of chart for sake of brevity.
58. Primarily the matter pertains to Rajasthan Public Examination, (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred as "Act of 1992") which received the assent of the Governor on 08.11.1992. On basis of material on record, the applicants were charged for offence under Section 3, 4, 5, 6 of the Act. Section 3 prohibits use of unfair means whereas Section 4 prescribes for unauthorized possession or disclosure of question paper and Section 5 prevention of leakage by person entrusted with examination work, Section 6 prescribes for provision of penalty for contravention of provision of Section 3, 4 or 5 with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years with fine which may extend ₹2000/- or both. As per Schedule, under Section 2 any examination conducted by RPSC is within the meaning of Section 2(b) of Public Examination. Unfair means has been defined under Section 2(c) as under:-

"(c) 'unfairmeans' in relation to an examination while answering question in a public examination, means the unauthorised help



from any person, or from any material written, recorded or printed, in any form whatsoever or the use of any unauthorised telephonic, wireless or electronic or other instrument or gadget;”

59. Thereafter, the Rajasthan Public Examination (Measures for prevention of Unfair Means in Recruitment and Act of 2022 (hereinafter referred as “Act of 2022”) was promulgated by State Legislature and same came into force on 06.04.2022 whereby the definition of unfair means is changed and exhaustive provisions are included in definition under Section 2(f) of the Act of 2022.

60. Similarly, new provisions under Sections 6 to 9 were introduced to prohibit leak of paper and acts of any institution or management. The provision of penalty provided under Section 10 and further coercive methods for their actions under Sections 11, 12 and 13 of Act. A provision of Designated Court is also provided under Section 17 of the Act.

61. The present case relates to old Act of 1992 wherein maximum punishment is 3 years. The offences such as cheating, cheating by impersonation, forgery, fabrication and conspiracy and breach of trust were also added against the applicants-accused. Since, we are considering the stage of bail, therefore, we are not concerned with the analogy particularly what offence made out against individual applicant.

62. In case of **The State of Karnataka vs Sri Darshan Etc. 2025 INSC 979** Hon’ble Supreme Court has referred the judgment in case of **Pinki Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh 2025**



INSC 482, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered the board principles for grant of bail. The Supreme Court underscored that while personal liberty is a cherished constitutional value, it is not absolute, liberty must yield where it poses a threat to the collective interest of society. No individual can claim a liberty that endangers the life or liberty of others, as the rational collective cannot tolerate anti-social or anti-collective conduct. Emphasizing that bail jurisprudence is inherently fact-specific, the Supreme Court reiterated that each bail application must be decided on its own merits, in light of the well settled on its own merits, in light of the well-settled parameters governing grant or denial of bail.

Broad principles of grant of bail (reproduced from judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court case of Sri Darshan (supra))

63. In **Gudikanti Narasimhulu and Others v. Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh reported in (1978) 1 SCC 240**, Krishna Iyer, J., while elaborating on the content of Article 21 of the Constitution of India in the context of personal liberty of a person under trial, has laid down the key factors that should be considered while granting bail, which are extracted as under: -

"7. It is thus obvious that the nature of the charge is the vital factor and the nature of the evidence also is pertinent. The punishment to which the party may be liable, if convicted or conviction is confirmed, also bears upon the issue.

8. Another relevant factor is as to whether the course of justice would be thwarted by him who seeks the benignant jurisdiction of the Court to be freed for the time being [Patrick Devlin, The



Criminal Prosecution in England (Oxford University Press, London 1960) p. 75 — Modern Law Review, Vol. 81, Jan. 1968, p. 54.] 9. Thus the legal principles and practice validate the Court considering the likelihood of the applicant interfering with witnesses for the prosecution or otherwise polluting the process of justice. It is not only traditional but rational, in this context, to enquire into the antecedents of a man who is applying for bail to find whether he has a bad record — particularly a record which suggests that he is likely to commit serious offences while on bail. In regard to habituals, it is part of criminological history that a thoughtless bail order has enabled the bailee to exploit the opportunity to inflict further crimes on the members of society. Bail discretion, on the basis of evidence about the criminal record of a defendant, is therefore not an exercise in irrelevance.”

(Emphasis supplied)

64. In **Prahlad Singh Bhati v. NCT, Delhi & Anr. reported in (2001) 4 SCC 280**, Hon’ble Supreme Court highlighted various aspects that the courts should keep in mind while dealing with an application seeking bail. The same may be extracted as follows:

“8. The jurisdiction to grant bail has to be exercised on the basis of wellsettled principles having regard to the circumstances of each case and not in an arbitrary manner. While granting the bail, the court has to keep in mind the nature of accusations, the nature of evidence in support thereof, the severity of the punishment which conviction will entail, the character, behaviour, means and standing of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused, reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, the larger interests of the public or State and similar other considerations. It has also to be kept in mind that for the purposes of granting the bail the Legislature has used the words “reasonable grounds for believing” instead of “the evidence” which means the court dealing with the grant of bail can only satisfy it (sic itself) as to whether there is a genuine case against the accused and that the prosecution will be able to produce prima facie evidence in support of the charge. [...]”

(Emphasis supplied)



65. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Ram Govind Upadhyay v. Sudarshan Singh reported in (2002) 3 SCC 598**, speaking through Banerjee, J., emphasised that a court exercising discretion in matters of bail, has to undertake the same judiciously. In highlighting that bail should not be granted as a matter of course, bereft of cogent reasoning, and observed as follows:

"3. Grant of bail though being a discretionary order — but, however, calls for exercise of such a discretion in a judicious manner and not as a matter of course. Order for bail bereft of any cogent reason cannot be sustained. Needless to record, however, that the grant of bail is dependent upon the contextual facts of the matter being dealt with by the court and facts, however, do always vary from case to case. While placement of the accused in the society, though may be considered but that by itself cannot be a guiding factor in the matter of grant of bail and the same should and ought always to be coupled with other circumstances warranting the grant of bail. The nature of the offence is one of the basic considerations for the grant of bail — more heinous is the crime, the greater is the chance of rejection of the bail, though, however, dependent on the factual matrix of the matter."

(Emphasis supplied)

66. In **Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan reported in (2004) 7 SCC 528**, Hon'ble Supreme Court held that although it is established that a court considering a bail application cannot undertake a detailed examination of evidence and an elaborate discussion on the merits of the case, yet the court is required to indicate the prima facie reasons justifying the grant of bail.

67. In **Prasanta Kumar Sarkar v. Ashis Chatterjee reported in (2010) 14 SCC 496**, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that where a High Court has granted bail



mechanically, the said order would suffer from the vice of non-application of mind, rendering it illegal. Hon'ble Supreme Court Court held as under with regard to the circumstances under which an order granting bail may be set aside. In doing so, the factors which ought to have guided the Court's decision to grant bail have also been detailed as under:

"9. [...] It is trite that this Court does not, normally, interfere with an order passed by the High Court granting or rejecting bail to the accused. However, it is equally incumbent upon the High Court to exercise its discretion judiciously, cautiously and strictly in compliance with the basic principles laid down in a plethora of decisions of this Court on the point. It is well settled that, among other circumstances, the factors to be borne in mind while considering an application for bail are:

- (i) whether there is any prima facie or reasonable ground to believe that the accused had committed the offence;*
- (ii) nature and gravity of the accusation;*
- (iii) severity of the punishment in the event of conviction;*
- (iv) danger of the accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail;*
- (v) character, behaviour, means, position and standing of the accused; (vi) likelihood of the offence being repeated;*
- (vii) reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being influenced; and*
- (viii) danger, of course, of justice being thwarted by grant of bail."*

(Emphasis supplied)

68. In **Bhoopendra Singh v. State of Rajasthan reported in (2021) 17 SCC 220**, Hon'ble Supreme Court Court made observations with respect to the exercise of appellate power to determine whether bail has been granted for valid reasons as distinguished from an application for cancellation of bail i.e. the Court distinguished between setting aside a perverse order granting bail vis-à-vis cancellation of bail on the ground that





the accused has misconducted himself or because of some new facts requiring such cancellation. Quoting **Mahipal v. Rajesh Kumar reported in (2020) 2 SCC 118**, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under:

"16. The considerations that guide the power of an appellate court in assessing the correctness of an order granting bail stand on a different footing from an assessment of an application for the cancellation of bail. The correctness of an order granting bail is tested on the anvil of whether there was an improper or arbitrary exercise of the discretion in the grant of bail. The test is whether the order granting bail is perverse, illegal or unjustified. On the other hand, an application for cancellation of bail is generally examined on the anvil of the existence of supervening circumstances or violations of the conditions of bail by a person to whom bail has been granted. [...]"

(Emphasis supplied)

69. One of the judgments on the aspect of application of mind and requirement of judicious exercise of discretion in arriving at an order granting bail to the accused is **Brijmani Devi v. Pappu Kumar reported in (2022) 4 SCC 497**, wherein a three-Judge Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court, while setting aside an unreasoned and casual order [**Pappu Kumar v. State of Bihar reported in (2021) SCC OnLine Pat 2856** and **Pappu Singh v. State of Bihar reported in (2021) SCC OnLine Pat 2857**] of the High Court granting bail to the accused, observed as follows:-

"35. While we are conscious of the fact that liberty of an individual is an invaluable right, at the same time while considering an application for bail courts cannot lose sight of the serious nature of the accusations against an accused and the facts that have a bearing in the case, particularly, when the accusations may not be false, frivolous or vexatious in nature but are supported by adequate material brought on record so as to enable a court to arrive at a prima facie conclusion. While considering an



application for grant of bail a prima facie conclusion must be supported by reasons and must be arrived at after having regard to the vital facts of the case brought on record. Due consideration must be given to facts suggestive of the nature of crime, the criminal antecedents of the accused, if any, and the nature of punishment that would follow a conviction vis-à-vis the offence(s) alleged against an accused."

(Emphasis supplied)

. In **Manoj Kumar Khokhar v. State of Rajasthan and Another reported in (2022) 3 SCC 501**, Her Ladyship B.V.

Nagarathna, J, speaking for the Bench observed as under:

"37. Ultimately, the court considering an application for bail has to exercise discretion in a judicious manner and in accordance with the settled principles of law having regard to the crime alleged to be committed by the accused on the one hand and ensuring purity of the trial of the case on the other.

38. Thus, while elaborate reasons may not be assigned for grant of bail or an extensive discussion of the merits of the case may not be undertaken by the court considering a bail application, an order dehors reasoning or bereft of the relevant reasons cannot result in grant of bail. In such a case the prosecution or the informant has a right to assail the order before a higher forum. As noted in *Gurcharan Singh v. State (Delhi Admn.)* [*Gurcharan Singh v. State (Delhi Admn.)*, (1978) 1 SCC 118 : 1978 SCC (Cri) 41 : 1978 Cri LJ 129], when bail has been granted to an accused, the State may, if new circumstances have arisen following the grant of such bail, approach the High Court seeking cancellation of bail under Section 439(2) CrPC. However, if no new circumstances have cropped up since the grant of bail, the State may prefer an appeal against the order granting bail, on the ground that the same is perverse or illegal or has been arrived at by ignoring material aspects which establish a prima facie case against the accused."

(Emphasis supplied)

71. We are absolutely conscious that liberty of a person should not be lightly dealt with, for deprivation of liberty of a person has immense impact on the mind of a person. Incarceration



creates a concavity in the personality of an individual. Sometimes it causes a sense of vacuum. Needless to emphasise, the sacrosanctity of liberty is paramount in a civilised society. However, in a democratic body polity which is wedded to the rule of law an individual is expected to grow within the social restrictions sanctioned by law. The individual liberty is restricted by larger social interest and its deprivation must have due sanction of law. In an orderly society an individual is expected to live with dignity having respect for law and also giving due respect to others' rights. It is a well-accepted principle that the concept of liberty is not in the realm of absolutism but is a restricted one. The cry of the collective for justice, its desire for peace and harmony and its necessity for security cannot be allowed to be trivialised. The life of an individual living in a society governed by the rule of law has to be regulated and such regulations which are the source in law subserve the social balance and function as a significant instrument for protection of human rights and security of the collective. This is because, fundamentally, laws are made for their obedience so that every member of the society lives peacefully in a society to achieve his individual as well as social interest. That is why Edmond Burke while discussing about liberty opined, "it is regulated freedom".

72. It is also to be kept in mind that individual liberty cannot be accentuated to such an extent or elevated to such a high pedestal which would bring in anarchy or disorder in the society. The prospect of greater justice requires that law and



order should prevail in a civilised milieu. True it is, there can be no arithmetical formula for fixing the parameters in precise exactitude but the adjudication should express not only application of mind but also exercise of jurisdiction on accepted and established norms. Law and order in a society protect the established precepts and see to it that contagious crimes do not become epidemic. In an organised society the concept of liberty basically requires citizens to be responsible and not to disturb the tranquility and safety which every well-meaning person desires. Not for nothing J. Oerter stated:

“Personal liberty is the right to act without interference within the limits of the law.”

73. Thus analysed, it is clear that though liberty is a greatly cherished value in the life of an individual, it is a controlled and restricted one and no element in the society can act in a manner by consequence of which the life or liberty of others is jeopardised, for the rational collective does not countenance an anti-social or anti-collective act. [See: **Ash Mohammad v. Shiv Raj Singh, reported in (2012) 9 SCC 446**].

74. Modern political scientist and philosopher, also favours certain limitation on liberty, for safeguarding the societal interest and professes the proportionality between the liberty and restriction, thus laying down exception for the personal liberty, in following words:

“Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites, in proportion as their love to justice is above their rapacity, in proportion as their soundness and sobriety of understanding is above their vanity and presumption, in proportion as they are more disposed to listen to the counsels



of the wise and good, in preference to the flattery of knaves. Society cannot exist, unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

(Emphasis supplied)

5. Hon'ble Supreme Court has also held that unlimited and unqualified liberty cannot be said to be in favour of societal interest. In **Kartar Singh v. State of Punjab reported in (1994) 3 SCC 569**, this Court observed:

"Liberty cannot stand alone but must be paired with companion virtue i.e. virtue and morality, liberty and law, liberty and justice, liberty and common good, liberty and responsibility which are concomitants for orderly progress and social stability. Man being a rationale individual has to live in harmony with equal rights of others and more differently for the attainment of antithetic desires. This intertwined network is difficult to delineate within defined spheres of conduct within which freedom of action may be confined. Therefore, liberty would not always be an absolute licence but must arm itself within the confines of law. In other words, there can be no liberty without social restraint. Liberty, therefore, as a social conception is a right to be assured to all members of a society. Unless restraint is enforced on and accepted by all members of the society, the liberty of some must involve the oppression of others. If liberty be regarded a social order, the problem of establishing liberty must be a problem of organising restraint which society controls over the individual. Therefore, liberty of each citizen is borne of and must be subordinated to the liberty of the greatest number, in other words common happiness as an end of the society, lest lawlessness and anarchy will tamper social weal and harmony and powerful courses or forces would be at work to undermine social welfare and order. Thus the essence of civil liberty is to keep alive the freedom of the individual subject to the limitation of social control which could be adjusted according to the needs of the dynamic social evolution."

(Emphasis supplied)

76. In **Gudikanti Narasimhulu (supra)** Hon'ble Court observed thus: -



"After all, personal liberty of an accused or convict is fundamental, suffering lawful eclipse only in terms of 'procedure established by law'. The last four words of Art. 21 are the life of that human right. The doctrine of Police Power constitutionally validates punitive processes for the maintenance of public order, security of the State, national integrity and the interest of the public generally. Even so, having regard to the solemn issue involved, deprivation of personal freedom, ephemeral or enduring, must be founded on the most serious considerations relevant to the welfare objectives of society, specified in the Constitution."

(Emphasis supplied)

Principle of Parity:-

77. Learned counsel has referred a judgment in case of **Shahrukh @ Banti Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh (supra)** on question of parity of granting bail.
78. The principle of parity in bail means, if an accused who is granted bail and a similarly placed accused has an identical role, involvement and circumstances then only he can seek bail on parity ground but it is not a rule of automatic bail for accused who subsequently applied for bail. The duty is upon the Court to examine actual role, criminal record and specific facts about each and every accused.
79. In case of **Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan (supra)** and **CBI v. Amaramani Tripathi (supra)**, Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered principle of parity and held that bail should not be decided solely on ground of parity and it is duty of the Court to evaluate individual role of other accused.



80. In recent judgment of **Tarun Kumar vs Assistant Director Directorate of Enforcement 2023 INSC 1006**, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that even in case of parity, requires consideration of the role played by accused as the parity is not the law but while applying the principle of parity, the Court is required to consider role and involvement of accused in commission of crime.

Information under Section 27 of Evidence Act

81. After considering the material available on record it has come to our notice that in some of the cases there is information or disclosure under Section 27 of Indian evidence Act (Corresponding provision under Section 23 of BSA) but there is no recovery or discovery in pursuant to said disclosure. The SOG has forwarded applicants-accused for trial only on basis of disclosure statement made under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act but a disclosure statement under Section 27 of Evidence Act which is in fact an exception to Sections 25 and 26 of Evidence Act is admissible only when it leads directly to discovery of a material fact previously unknown to SOG.

82. The foundation under Section 27 of Evidence Act is based on proof of confirmation by subsequent events and reliability of such statement is confirmed only when actual recovery of fact or discovery occurs based on information disclosed by accused, therefore, any statement made any accused while in police custody under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act is not admissible in evidence when it has not lead to any discovery of any material fact. The manner in which a crime is committed



and if same is disclosed under Section 27 of Evidence Act then it is inadmissible in evidence and same cannot be read against the accused as Article 20(3) of Indian Constitution protects accused from self-incrimination.

Women applicants:-

3. Applicants-accused Manisha Sihag, Santosh, Indubala, Vimla, Chammi Bai @ Samita, Monika (also mother of new born baby), Indra @ Indu Kumari, Versha are female applicants and Section 437 of Cr.P.C. (Corresponding Section 480 of BNSS) contains exception that a Court may grant bail, if such person is a woman or sick or infirm in case of non-bailable offence. Even, Section 45 of the PMLA provides an exception for woman to allow Courts to bypass strict bail conditions and release a female accused at the discretion of Court. Though, these provisions were considered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in a case relating to a Deputy Secretary or OSD of a State involved in money laundering wherein Somya Chaurasia (**Somya Chaurasia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement 2023 INSC 1073**) was denied bail despite provisions of Section 45 of PMLA.

84. In case of **K. Kavita Vs. Directorate of Enforcement (2024) INSC 632**, Hon'ble Supreme Court has set aside the order of refusal of bail to woman, and after considering judgment in case of **Manish Sisodiya Vs. Directorate of Enforcement 2024 INSC 595** and **Soumya Chaurasia (supra)** has granted bail to woman accused.



85. In case of **R.D. Upadhyay Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh (supra)** Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered a writ petition where women having children with them are languishing in jail. Similarly, in case of **Sheela Barse & Anr. Vs. Union of India and Ors. AIR 1986 SC 1773** Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that a children is a national asset and it is the duty of the State to look after the child with view to ensuring full development of its personality.

Period of Custody:-

86. Individually it appears that accused Sharwanram @ Sharwan Babal, Jairaj Singh, Naresh Dan Charan, Harshvardhan Kumar Meena, Sunil Kumar Beniwal, Manisha Sihag, Rinku Sharma, Shyam Pratap Singh, Rajesh Khandelwal, Shrawan Kumar Godara, Rajendra @ Raju, Ashok Singh Nathawat, Indu, Vikramjeet Vishnoi, Tulchharam Kaler, Rajender Kumar Yadav, Shaitanaram, Ramuram Raika, Chammi Bai, Gammaram, Arun Kumar, Anil Kumar Meena, Om Prakash Dhaka, Bhupender Saran are in custody for more than one year whereas Gopal @ Gopal Saran, Somesh Godara, Arjun Kumar Prajapat are likely to complete period of one year from September, 2025. All other accused are in custody for a period less than 11 months.

87. In case of **Neeru Yadav Vs. State of U.P.** is referred and relied in a 3 Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Imran Vs. Mohammed Bhava (Criminal Appeal No. 658-659 of 2022 Order dated 22.04.2022)**. Similarly, in case of State through **CBI v. Amaramani Tripathi (2005) 8 SCC 2021, Kalyan Chandra Sarkar Vs. Rajesh Ranjan**



(supra), **Ash Mohammed Vs. Shiv Raj Singh @ Lala Bahu & Anr. (2012) 9 SCC 446** and **Ajwar Vs. Waseem 10 SCC 768** while considering the period of incarceration or custody undergone by accused Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the period of custody itself would not entitle the accused to being enlarged on bail when gravity of the offence alleged to be severe.

88. In case of Ram **Govind Upadhyay Vs. Sudarshan Singh (2002) 3 SCC 598**, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that nature of offence is one of the basic consideration for grant for grant of bail as more heinous is the crime, the greater is the chance of refusal of the bail, though exercise of judicial discretion in such matters may be exhaustively defined.

Consideration of grant/refusal of bail-

89. Having considered the legal position as laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in cases referred hereinabove and also in case of **P. Chidambaram Vs. Directorate of Enforcement (2019) 9 SCC 2024** we are of the considered view that the relevant consideration for grant of bail are as under:-

- (i) Nature and gravity of the acquisition levied against the petitioner;
- (ii) Nature of evidence in support of acquisition;
- (iii) Severity of punishment for conviction will entail;
- (iv) Criminal antecedents of the applicant;
- (v) Ensuring and securing presence of the accused at the trial;



(vi) Reasonable apprehension of influencing or tampering the evidence ;

(vii) Any other peculiar circumstances attached with any particular accused;

(viii) Larger interest of society and impact of order on society;

90. Having considered the material available on record and also considering the fact that these candidates are women and one of them is mother of new born baby while in custody are entitled to be benefit of judgment in case of **R.D. Upadhyay Vs. State of AP (supra)**. Thus, I am of the considered view in case like present one it is appropriate to grant bail to woman applicants, therefore, these candidates are entitled for bail.

91. Accused Mahender Kumar is a photographer and considering a fact that he morphed photographs of original candidate(s) and dummy candidate(s) and after intermixing them created a new photograph so as to give resemblance equivalent to original candidate(s) so that dummy candidate(s) may not be identified by Centre Superintendent or invigilator while on duty at Examination Centre. It is case of the SOG that he charged remuneration of ₹150, 200 for morphing the photograph, thus, considering his role and involvement, I am of the considered view that he is entitled for bail.

92. Now, we are considering individual cases in following manner:-

(i) **Sharwanram @ Sharwan Babal :-** The present-applicant is father of candidate Chanchal and he allegedly



procured paper for her daughter. There are criminal antecedents against the applicants-accused but none of them relating to use of unfair means in any public examination. The evidence against him is only information under Section 27 of Indian Evidence Act. The applicant-accused is in custody since 27.03.2024 so he is entitled to be released on bail.

(ii) **Jairaj Singh S/o Aasu Singh:-** The present applicant is in custody since 03.04.2024 and there is no criminal antecedents against him and he is a candidate who used bluetooth device and got selected. Considered the material collected against him and he is in custody for more than one year, therefore, he is entitled to be released on bail.

(iii) **Naresh Dan Charan S/o Shri Ratan Dan Charan:-** There are two more cases for compromising the sanctity of public examination against him and one under Section 420 and 120-B IPC. He is in custody for more than one year but he is a part of an organized racket, who compromised the sanctity of public examination, therefore, considering his role and involvement and material on record he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(iv) **Harshvardhan Kumar Meena S/o Murari Lal Meena:-** The present applicant is in custody for more than one year and he is also a part of paper leak gang and having connection with Rinku Sharma and others and several financial transactions were mentioned by SOG. Considering his role, involvement and gravity of the offence and also involvement in similar nature of cases he is not entitled to be released on bail.



(v) **Sunil Kumar Beniwal S/o Dhimaram:-** The present applicant was alleged to be part of paper leak gang and three more cases of year 2015 to 2017 were shown against him but herein this case he assisted his sister-in-law Rajeshwari Bishnoi thus, considering role and involvement of present applicant-accused he is entitled to be released on bail.

(vi) **Rinku Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Naval Kishore Sharma:-** The present applicant alleged as one of the mastermind of a gang with involvement of with Harshvardhan Kumar Meena, Rajender, Ashok Singh Nathawat and others, as listed by SOG and one more case prior to present one is registered against applicant-accused wherein a charge-sheet has been filed against him. Considering material available on record, he is not entitled to be released on bail despite that he is in custody for more than one year.

(vii) **Shyam Pratap Singh S/o Shri Bhagwan Singh:-** The present applicant is in custody since 14.04.2024 and there is no antecedents against him. He did not appear in examination and in his place Ashok Kumar who was absconder has appeared as a candidate. Considering aforesaid, he is entitled to be released on bail.

(viii) **Rajesh Khandelwal S/o Late Shri Dwarka Prasad:-** The present applicant is the person who assigned duty to Unik Bhambhu @ Pankaj Choudhary so that he may send paper before the examination on Whatsapp to others. The role and involvement is very serious and grave as he facilitated in paper leak, with premeditated plan. There is no criminal



antecedents against the applicant and he is in custody for more than one year, I am of the considered view that he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(ix) **Sharwan Kumar Godara S/o Shri Birbal Ram**

Godara:- The present applicant is in custody since 14.04.2024 and instead of appearing as a candidate he used Ashok Kumar Godara as dummy candidate who is still absconding. There is sufficient evidence on record to show that this applicant-accused has not appeared as a candidate. The applicant-accused is an ex-serviceman and he is aware about the fact that while getting appointment in quota he cannot engage a dummy candidate, therefore, he is not entitled to be released on bail, though he is in custody for more than one year.

(x) **Rajendra Kumar Yadav @ Raju S/o Shri Tejpal:-**

The applicant-accused is in custody since 06.03.2024 and there are two more cases for compromising the sanctity of public examination. As per report of the SOG, the present applicant is having connection with Ashok Singh Nathawat, thus, considering gravity of the matter this applicant-accused is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xi) **Ashok Singh Nathawat S/o Rudaram:-** The present

applicant-accused is in custody since 16.03.2024 and he is also part of a gang worked with Rinku Sharma and others. There are three cases reported against the applicant-accused about compromising the sanctity of public examination, thus he is not entitled to be released on bail.



(xii) **Vikramjeet Vishnoi S/o Shri Sagarram Vishnoi:-**

The present applicant-accused is in custody since 14.04.2024 and in his place he used Girdhari Ram as a candidate and Girdhari Ram was granted bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court. The applicant was selected as Sub-Inspector without appearing as a candidate in public examination. Considering his role, involvement and gravity of the matter he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xiii) **Bhagirath Vishnoi S/o Shri Jaikishan:-** The present applicant is a candidate having connection with operator and a specific call logs along with other material on record to show gravity of the matter. The present applicant by compromising sanctity of public examination got selected, therefore, considering his role and involvement and impact on public, not entitled to be released on bail.

(xiv) **Lokesh Sharma S/o Late Rambabu Sharma:-** The present applicant was running a coaching centre in name of his wife and as per information, he referred name of two candidates. Considering the material on record and also his role and involvement he is entitled to be released on bail.

(xv) **Tulchharam Kaler S/o Asharam:-** The present applicant is in custody since 09.06.2024 and he is one of the mastermind and 15 cases mostly relating to compromising sanctity of public examination were registered against him. Having considered his role, involvement and gravity of the matter he is not entitled to be released on bail.



(xvi) **Rajendra Kumar Yadav S/o Sh. Dwarka Prasad**

Yadav:- The present applicant is in custody since 06.03.2024 and the allegation is arranging and sending the paper on Whatsapp to his son Siddhant who is JEN in Public Works Department. Having considered role, involvement and material he is entitled to be released on bail.

(xvii) **Gopal @ Gopal Saran S/o Paburam:-** The present applicant is in custody since 28.09.2024 and he is one of the mastermind having connection with several persons involved in compromising the sanctity of public examination. There were four cases against him and one relates to public examination but considering his role and involvement he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xviii) **Somesh Godara S/o Jagram Godara:-** The present applicant is one of the operator of Adarsh Bal Senior Secondary School, Jodhpur wherein he facilitated candidates. There were two more cases relating to compromise sanctity in public examination. Thus, considering his role and involvement he is not entitled to be released on bail, though he is in custody since 05.09.2024.

(xix) **Shaitanaram S/o Mohanlal:-** The present applicant is in custody since 12.08.2024 and similarly placed person Suresh Sahu is granted bail. Considering his role, involvement and material on record he is entitled to be released on bail.

(xx) **Ramuram Raika S/o Late Shri Bhopalram Raika:-** The present applicant is a member of RPSC and played role just like 'Dhritrastra' in Mahabharat. He misused his official



position and has procured paper form ill-famed member of RPSC Babu Lal Katara and provided it to his son Devesh and daughter Shobha, who were selected with the help of the Chairman of RPSC and other members of RPSC. The father of two children was arrayed as an accused as he misused his official position. Having considered the entirety of facts and circumstances particularly procuring a paper and further canvassing candidature of son and daughter, I am of the considered view that since there is no role in financial involvement, he is entitled to be released on bail.

(xxi) **Gamaram Alias Ghamaram Khileri S/o**

Poonmaram:- The present applicant has been named as one of the gang member having connivance with Bhupender and there were four other cases relating to compromising the public sanctity of public examination, and three relating to 2022 which indicate that applicant is continuously involved in paper leaking matters. Thus, considering his role and involvement of present applicant, this applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxii) **Arun Sharma S/o Sanwarmal:-** The present applicant is in custody since 11.07.2024 and he was named as handler and a member of Anil Kumar @ Sher Singh's gang. Considering his role, involvement and material on record, he is entitled to be released on bail.

(xxiii) **Anil Kumar Meena @ Sher Singh Meena S/o**

Gopal Meena:- The present applicant is one the kingpin of the entire scam who was recently granted bail in another case



and he is in custody since 16.03.2024 but there are 5 cases against the applicant accused and all relating to compromising in sanctity of public examination. His role and involvement is emphasised by SOG and considering material on record, I am of the considered view that he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxiv) **Arjun Kumar Parjapat S/o Shri Rajendra Kumar:-**

The allegation upon present applicant is helping Vijender Kumar in cheating and SOG has submitted financial transaction trail of his brother, there are two criminal cases but none of them are relating to public examination. Considering his role and material on record he is entitled to be released on bail.

(xxv) **Kamlesh Dhaka S/o Shri Mangilal:-** The present applicant has been shown as associate of Suresh Sahu who was granted bail. He is in custody since 19.02.2025 and two cases are against him and both relating to compromising in sanctity of public examination. Considering, material collected on record, role and involvement, he is entitled to be released on bail.

(xxvi) **Omprakash Dhaka S/o Shri Kishnaram:-** The present applicant is one the operator who distributed solved paper to student through his handlers. There were four cases registered against him and three relating to compromising the sanctity of public examination. Having considered the material on record, he is not entitled to be released on bail.



(xxvii) **Bhupendra Saran S/o Paburam:-** The present applicant has been shown as active member of Jagdish Vishnoi Gang and charged for distribution of paper through handlers. 12 cases are reported against him and mostly relating to compromising in public sanctity of public examination. Considering his role and involvement, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxviii) **Narpatlal S/o Shankraram:-** The present applicant is in custody since 05.04.2025. He is husband of Indra Kumari @ Indu and he played a role in financial transactions and also facilitated his wife to appear as dummy candidate in place of Harku who selected as Sun-Inspector. The present applicant is having a contact and communication with another kingpin Ram Niwas Bishnoi. Considering his role and involvement, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxix) **Vijendra Kumar Joshi S/o Madanlal Joshi:-** The present applicant is a candidate and still a charge-sheet has not been filed against him and he is in custody since 06.06.2025, therefore he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxx) **Madanlal S/o Shri Radhakishan:-** The present applicant was a candidate and he was an ex-serviceman and instead of appearing in examination he engaged Ashok Kumar Godara for appearing in examination on 15.09.2021 and he paid money and ultimately got selected. The material forwarded by SOG and considering aforesaid, present applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.



(xxxi) **Sandeep Kumar Lata S/o Kanheyalal:-** The present applicant in connivance of Kundan Kumar Pandya has procured paper from Babu Lal Katara. Though, SOG submits that charge-sheet has not been filed but the counsel for applicant submits that charge-sheet has been filed. Considering the role and involvement assigned by SOG, he is not entitled to be released on bail, who is in custody since 04.07.2025.

(xxxii) **Ramkhiladi Meena S/o Tejram Meena:-** The present applicant is in custody and he was a candidate and charge-sheet has been filed. Present applicant-accused was selected but he has not appeared in examination rather engaged a dummy candidate. Having considered the material available on record he is not entitled for bail.

(xxxiii) **Paurav Kaler S/o Om Prakash Jat:-** The present applicant is shown as one the Kingpin with Tulchharam Kaler and we have considered his role and involvement and also. 10 cases registered against him. I am of the considered view that looking to seriousness, gravity and involvement, present applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxxiv) **Deepak Rahad @ Monu S/o Late Shri Banwarilal:-** The allegation on present applicant is helping his wife and his sister-in-law. Having considered material available on record, and his role and involvement he is entitled to be released on bail.

(xxxv) **Virendra Meena S/o Shri Ashok Kumar Meena:-** The present applicant is in custody and he was a candidate. SOG has procured FSL report against him and he got selected.



The material indicate that instead of him, Om Prakash has appeared as dummy candidate. Therefore, considering aforesaid he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxxvi) **Hanumanaram S/o Shri Kaushlaram:-** The present applicant is a RAS Officer and despite being in public service he indulged with Ram Niwas Bishnoi and appeared as dummy candidate and helped them in getting selection. There is another case against the applicant-accused, Thus, considering role and involvement of applicant-accused he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxxvii) **Ramesh Kumar Vishnoi S/o Foosaram:-** The present applicant is in custody since 02.05.2025 and he is also shown as one of the middleman/handler involved in compromising the sanctity of public examination. There were three cases reported against the applicant and two related to public examination. Considering his role and involvement, present applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxxviii) **Swaroop Chand Meena S/o Shri Ramkishan @ Kishan Lal:-** The present applicant is in custody since 10.03.2025. SOG has shown him as one of the associate with Rinku Singh and others. There is one more case relating to compromise in sanctity of public examination. Considering his role and involvement, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(xxxix) **Ajay Pratap Singh S/o Nadan Singh:-** The present applicant was a candidate and the allegation upon applicant is that he read the paper and he cleared the written examination but he failed in physical examination and ultimately not



selected. There is no allegation of financial transaction against applicant-accused. Presently, he is working as a Stenographer in Revenue Board Ajmer. While considering the material on record, he is entitled to be released on bail.

(XL) **Kundan Kumar Pandya S/o Late Shri Dinker**

Pandya:- The present applicant was shown as one of the mastermind working with Sandeep Kumar Lata and Purshottam Dadhich in procuring paper from Babu Lal Katara and Vijay Kumar (relative of Babulal) and further distributing and selling it to other candidates. Three of his relatives have appeared in examination and he procured all papers. The SOG has listed several communication with other accused involved in the matter. Considering his role and gravity of the matter, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(XLI) **Ramniwas Vishnoi S/o Sukhram Vishnoi:-** The present applicant is working as *Grade-III* Teacher and his role and involvement is shown as facilitator and also as a candidate, who engaged Hanumanaram (RAS). Having considered the material available on record and also considering his role and involvement with other accused he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(XLII) **Buddhisagar Upadhyay S/o Late Shri Radhakant**

Upadhyay:- Present applicant is father of Aditya Upadhyay who procured paper for his son from Kundan Kumar Pandya. He is not involved in other matter. Thus, after considering material on record and his role he is entitled to be released on bail.



(XLIII) **Aditya Upadhyay S/o Shri Buddhisagar**

Upadhyay:- The present applicant is a candidate and son of Buddhisagar Upadhyay. He procured paper through his father and he got selected. Looking to the gravity of the matter, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

(XLIIV) **Purushottam Dadhich S/o Mahaveer Prasad**

Sharma:- The present applicant has been named as a person who involved with Kundan Kumar Pandya and Babu Lal Katara. SOG has listed several of his links along with his acts committed by him. He also filed a misc. petition under Section of 482 Cr.P.C. which was dismissed on cost. Considering his role and involvement, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

93. Having considered the material available on record and also the fact that there was a widespread leak of question paper along with answer sheet relating to *Sub-Inspector Recruitment Examination, 2021*. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court while considering gravity in case of **Kailesh Chand Sharma Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. (S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13806/2024 Order dated 28.08.2025)** has made several observations including scrapping of entire examination. The material forwarded in case diary by SOG indicate involvement of large number of persons in compromising the sanctity of public examination organized by RPSC, though, it is an act of very very serious nature, wherein role of the State functionaries is under serious scrutiny in defrauding public at large in a systematic manner. It also indicate role and involvement of money and also widespread corruption with



connivance and conspiracy at highest level. It is painful fact that examination was conducted in 2021 and after 3 years the matters were opened and that too by SOG on complaint but for three years the entire system of the State has paralyzed and has not noticed leaking of papers and further cheating at mass scale which indicate that the system has become not only corrupt but it has become rotten. The youths particularly unemployed and educated section of state is shocked from the revelation of mass rigging of public examination.

94. Thus, the instant bail applications filed on behalf of applicants-accused **Sharwanram @ Sharwan Babal S/o Harsukhram, Jairaj Singh S/o Aasu Singh, Sunil Kumar Beniwal S/o Dhimaram, Manisha Siyag D/o Shri Arjunram Siyag, Shyam Pratap Singh S/o Shri Bhagwan Singh, Santosh D/o Shri Gogaram, Indubala D/o Shri Bhagwanaram, Lokesh Sharma S/o Late Rambabu Sharma, Rajendra Kumar Yadav S/o Sh. Dwarka Prasad Yadav, Vimla W/o Gopiram Jangu, Shaitanaram S/o Mohanlal, Ramuram Raika S/o Late Shri Bhopalram Raika, Smt. Chammi Bai alias Sammi alias Samita D/o Aasuram W/o Ganpatlal, Smt. Monika D/o Ramdhan W/o Vikas, Arun Sharma S/o Sanwarmal Sharma, Arjun Kumar Parjapat S/o Shri Rajendra Kumar, Kamlesh Dhaka S/o Shri Mangilal, Mahendra Kumar S/o Manchharam Borana, Indra @ Indu Kumari D/o Gangaram, Ms. Varsha D/o Shri Tejaram Sau, Deepak Rahad @ Monu S/o Late Shri Banwarilal, Ajay Pratap Singh S/o Nadan Singh and**



Buddhisagar Upadhyay S/o Late Shri Radhakant

Upadhyay, are hereby allowed and the applicants- accused are ordered to be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond of ₹50,000/- with two sureties of like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court with the following conditions:-

- (i) The applicants-accused shall not tamper with evidence or influence the witness in any manner.
- (ii) The applicants-accused shall not indulge in any criminal activity and shall not repeat any criminal offence punishable under the law.
- (iii) The applicants-accused shall attend the hearing of the Trial Court on the date fixed by the Trial Court or as and when asked to appear before the Trial Court.

95. In case of any violation of above conditions, the bail granted to the applicants-accused shall be liable to be canceled.

96. In view of discussion made hereinabove, the Bail Applications preferred by the applicants-accused **Naresh Dan Charan S/o Shri Ratan Dan Charan, Harshvardhan Kumar Meena S/o Murari Lal Meena, Rinku Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Naval Kishore Sharma, Rajesh Khandelwal S/o Late Shri Dwarka Prasad, Sharwan Kumar Godara S/o Shri Birbal Ram Godara, Rajendra Kumar Yadav @ Raju S/o Shri Tejpal, Ashok Singh Nathawat S/o Rudaram, Vikramjeet Vishnoi S/o Shri Sagarram Vishnoi, Bhagirath Vishnoi S/o Shri Jaikishan, Tulchharam Kaler S/o Asharam, Gopal @ Gopal Saran S/o Paburam, Somesh Godara S/o Jagram Godara, Gamaram Alias Ghamaram Khileri S/o**



Poonmaram, Anil Kumar Meena @ Sher Singh Meena S/o Gopal Meena, Omprakash Dhaka S/o Shri Kishnaram, Bhupendra Saran S/o Paburam, Narpatlal S/o Shankraram, Vijendra Kumar Joshi S/o Madanlal Joshi, Madanlal S/o Shri Radhakishan, Sandeep Kumar Lata S/o Kanheyalal, Ramkhiladi Meena S/o Tejram Meena, Paurav Kaler S/o Om Prakash Jat, Virendra Meena S/o Shri Ashok Kumar Meena, Hanumanaram S/o Shri Kaushlaram, Ramesh Kumar Vishnoi S/o Foosaram, Swaroop Chand Meena S/o Shri Ramkishan @ Kishan Lal, Kundan Kumar Pandya S/o Late Shri Dinker Pandya, Ramniwas Vishnoi S/o Sukhram Vishnoi, Aditya Upadhyay S/o Shri Buddhisagar Upadhyay and Purushottam Dadhich S/o Mahaveer Prasad Sharma are hereby **dismissed**.

97. The Registry is directed to place a copy of this order in each file.
98. The Registry is also directed to send a copy of this order to the Trial Court through E-mail.

(ASHOK KUMAR JAIN),J

MONU KAMRA /31-83