

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

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 3/2026

Piyush Kumar Trivedi S/o Shri Vinod Kumar Trivedi, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Near Pg College, In Front Of First Tower, Police Station Kotwali, District Dausa. (Accused Is In Judicial Custody At Central Jail Jaipur). -----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp -----Respondent

Connected With

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 4/2026

Subham Gurjar S/o Shri Guman Singh Gurjar, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Gram Kherwal, Tehsil Dausa, District Dausa, Rajasthan. (At Present Confined In Central Jail Jaipur). -----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp --Respondent

---

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Jitendra Pandey, Adv. Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Adv. Mr. Ketan Dhabhai, Adv. Mr. Amit Puri, Adv. Mr. Jai Kumar Jain, Adv. Ms. Keerti, Adv. Ms. Bhumika Goyal, Adv. for Mr. Samarth Kumar Jain, Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Shree Ram Dhakar, Public Prosecutor.

---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEER BHATNAGAR**

**Order**

Date of conclusion of arguments:- 12.05.2026

Date on which the judgment  
was Reserved :- 12.05.2026

Whether the full judgment or only the operative part is  
pronounced:- Full Judgment

Date of pronouncement:-

15.05.2026

1. These bail applications under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 have been filed on behalf of the accused-petitioners arising out of FIR No.34/2025 dated 16.07.2025 registered at Police Station SOG, Jaipur for offences under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, 'IPC') along with Section 66-D of the Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008 (for short, 'IT Act') against the order dated 24.12.2025 passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge No.7, Jaipur Metropolitan-II, Jaipur whereby the bail application preferred by the accused-petitioner came to be rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the accused-petitioners submits that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in the present case. It is contended that owing to matrimonial and personal disputes between the family of petitioner- Piyush Kumar and the complainant, the present FIR has been lodged with an oblique motive to settle personal scores. It is further contended that accused petitioner- Shubham Gurjar has been implicated solely on the basis of statements of co-accused persons and no independent incriminating material has been placed on record against him.

3. It is further submitted that petitioners had pursued their Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery ('MBBS') course from Georgia and had appeared in the Foreign Medical Graduate Examination (for short, 'FMGE') examination earlier, however, he had no knowledge regarding the alleged forged nature of the FMGE result and certificate. It is submitted that the complainant himself had collected the relevant documents and submitted the

online applications and thereafter informed the petitioner that he had qualified the examination, on the basis whereof the petitioner applied for internship bona fide believing the documents to be genuine.

4. It is further submitted that the petitioners have not prepared any forged document themselves and have been falsely implicated in the matter, the investigation stands completed and charge-sheet has already been filed and no further custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required. It is further contended that the accused petitioners- Piyush Kumar and Shubham Gurjar have been in judicial custody since 02.12.2025 and 03.12.2025 respectively and the trial is likely to take considerable time, continued incarceration of the accused petitioners would serve no useful purpose, particularly when they have no criminal antecedents and there is no likelihood of absconding or tampering with evidence, therefore, considering the aforesaid facts and long incarceration of the accused petitioners, the present bail applications may be allowed.

5. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail applications and submitted that during investigation, it was found that despite having failed the FMGE examination, accused petitioners in collusion with other co-accused persons, procured a forged FMGE Screening Test Pass Certificate and fake Roll No.2311200091 upon payment of huge monetary consideration and verification from National Board of Examinations in Medical Sciences ('NBEMS') revealed that the said roll number belonged to another candidate.

6. Learned Public Prosecutor further submits that the forged certificate was subsequently used for obtaining internship counselling through the Rajasthan Medical Council ('RMC') and for completing internship on the basis of forged credentials and the material collected during investigation clearly establishes active involvement of the petitioners in an organised conspiracy involving preparation and use of forged examination documents. It is also submitted that offences of the present nature have serious societal ramifications as they undermine the sanctity and credibility of competitive examinations and professional regulatory systems, thereby adversely affecting genuine and meritorious candidates, therefore, the present bail applications may be dismissed.

7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

8. It has come on record that during the course of investigation, despite having failed multiple attempts in the FMGE examination, the accused petitioner- Piyush Kumar Trivedi, entered into a criminal conspiracy with the accused petitioner- Shubham Gurjar, and co-accused Devendra Singh Gurjar for procurement of a fake Roll No.2311200091 upon payment of Rs.6 lakh and pursuant thereto, a forged Screening Test Pass Certificate was procured and thereafter utilized by the petitioner Piyush Kumar Trivedi for seeking internship counselling through the RMC, on the basis whereof he also completed internship by using forged and fabricated documents.

9. The charge-sheet further reveals that petitioner- Piyush Kumar Trivedi had contacted petitioner- Shubham Gurjar for

arranging a forged Screening Test Pass Certificate, allegedly prepared through co-accused Devendra Singh Gurjar and thereafter, the accused petitioner- Shubham Gurjar and co-accused Devendra Singh Gurjar approached co-accused Bhana Ram Saini alias Bhanu regarding financial arrangements for procurement of the forged certificate and facilitation of registration with the RMC; thereafter, an amount of Rs.16 lakh was agreed to be paid for the said illegal arrangement, out of which Rs.3 lakh was to be paid in advance prior to issuance of the forged certificate and an additional amount of Rs.3 lakh upon delivery thereof.

10. Furthermore, the investigation reveals that co-accused Bhana Ram Saini prepared a forged Screening Test Pass Certificate pertaining to the December, 2023 FMGE examination in the name of petitioner- Piyush Kumar. The said forged certificate was allegedly handed over to accused petitioner- Shubham Gurjar, who in turn facilitated its delivery to petitioner- Piyush Kumar through co-accused Devendra Singh Gurja and on the basis of the aforesaid forged document, petitioner- Piyush Kumar applied for internship counselling through the RMC and completed internship by using such forged credentials and ultimately, upon completion of investigation, the police submitted the charge-sheet against the accused petitioners for offences under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC along with Section 66-D of the IT Act.

11. Moreover, this Court cannot remain oblivious to the increasing trend of preparation and use of forged educational documents, mark-sheets, degree certificates and examination credentials for securing professional opportunities and

employment as such acts not only strike at the very root of the sanctity and credibility of competitive examinations, but also seriously prejudice the rights of genuine and meritorious candidates who compete through lawful means. Furthermore, offences of the present nature, involving fabrication of examination-related documents and fraudulent procurement of professional credentials, have far-reaching consequences upon public confidence in institutional and regulatory systems.

12. This Court also cannot lose sight of the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Rajasthan Vs. Indraj Singh Etc., 2025 INSC 341**, wherein, while considering offences involving manipulation of examination processes, it was observed as under:-:-

"9. Keeping in view the above pronouncements of law, we are of the view that the Trial Court had been correct in denying bail to the respondents herein. Considerations by the High Court of lack of criminal antecedents and the period of custody are perfectly valid criteria for grant of bail, but the Court while giving due credence to them, cannot lose sight of the primary offence and its effect on society.

13. In India, the reality is that there are far more takers of Government jobs than there are jobs available. Be that as it may, each job which has a clearly delineated entry process - with prescribed examination and/or interview process, has only to be filled in accordance thereof. Absolute scrupulousness in the process being followed instills and further rejuvenates the faith of the public in the fact that those who are truly deserving of the

positions, are the ones who have deservedly been installed to such positions. Each act, such as the one allegedly committed by the respondents represent possible chinks in the faith of the people in the public administration and the executive.

14. Since surely there must have been thousands of people who appeared for the exam, and the respondent-accused persons, for their own benefit, tried to compromise the sanctity of the exam, possibly affecting so many of those who would have put in earnest effort to appear in the exam in the hopes of securing a job, we concur with the view of the Trial Court that they are not entitled to the benefit of bail. At the same time, it is also true that every person has a presumption of innocence working in their favour till and such time the offence they are charged with, stands proved beyond reasonable doubt. Let them stand trial, and let it be established by the process of law, that the respondent accused have indeed not committed any crime in law.”  
(Emphasis Supplied)

15. Therefore, considering the gravity and nature of allegations, the manner in which the forged documents are alleged to have been prepared and utilized, as also the larger societal impact of such organised fraudulent activities but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the accused petitioners on bail.

16. Accordingly, the present bail applications filed by accused petitioners are hereby dismissed.

(PRAVEER BHATNAGAR),J