

Bail Matters 878/2026
STATE Vs. SPARSH CHAUHAN
FIR No. 9/2026
PS- (Crime Branch-South East)
u/s 9/11 PEA & Sections 318/316(2)/61(2)/112/3(5) BNS

04.04.2026

Present application has been taken up in terms of Order No. 10 dated 06.03.2026 passed by Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge, SED, Saket Courts, New Delhi. (Roster)

This is an application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Sparsh Chauhan for grant of regular bail.

Present: Sh. S. K. Kain, Ld. Addl. PP for the State.
Sh. Sanjiv Malik, Ld. Counsel for the
applicant/accused.

1. Vide this order, this Court shall adjudicate upon the regular bail application filed on behalf of the applicant/accused Sparsh Chauhan. Arguments were heard at length, the gist whereof is discussed hereunder.

2. Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused submitted that the applicant/accused has been languishing in JC since 15.01.2026. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present matter as he has nothing to do with the alleged offences and that the allegations levelled against the applicant/accused are false and fabricated. Ld. Counsel further submitted that no recovery has been effected from the applicant/accused or at his instance and he was arrested merely on the disclosure statement of co-accused and the same is inadmissible in law. Ld. Counsel further

submitted that the applicant/accused had himself come forward and joined the investigation in the present matter and has already undergone 6 days PC remand and further, the investigation in the present case stands complete with the filing of the chargesheet. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the co-accused persons namely Amit Kumar and Akshay Chauhan have already been granted bail by this court vide orders dated 01.04.2026 and 02.04.2026 respectively. Ld. Counsel further submitted that the applicant/accused has clean past antecedents. Ld. Counsel further submitted that in the present case, the investigation has already been completed and chargesheet has been filed before the concerned court, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars further. Ld. Counsel thus, prayed that applicant/accused ought to be granted bail and he is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions imposed upon him by this court.

3. *Per contra* Ld. Addl. PP for the State along with opposed the bail application citing the gravity of the offences as one of the main grounds. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the applicant/accused is an active member of an organized criminal syndicate and the offence is grave, involving large-scale manipulation of public examinations and that the applicant/accused played a part of a larger interstate cheating syndicate, and several co-accused persons are yet to be apprehended. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that the role of the present applicant/accused is different from co-accused persons, who have already granted bail by this court. Ld. Addl. PP further

submitted that the applicant/accused has CDR connectivity with the IRA Assessment lab's officials namely Kolanji and accused Anuj Yadav and that he is the relative of the prime suspect Akshay and some of the co-accused persons are yet to be arrested and further investigation of the case is still continued. Ld. Addl. PP further submitted that there is likelihood of influencing witnesses and tampering with evidence. Thus, the applicant/accused ought not to be granted bail.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the opposite parties and also perused the records.

5. It is settled law that the Court, while considering the application for grant of bail, has to keep certain factors in mind, such as, whether there is a *prima facie* case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment, the danger of the accused absconding or fleeing if released on bail; reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened; etc.

6. The present case pertains to a well-organized and structured racket involving manipulation of Government examinations through use of unfair means, thereby undermining the sanctity and integrity of public recruitment processes. The allegations against the applicant are grave and serious in nature. As per the prosecution, the accused persons were operating a sophisticated interstate cheating syndicate through M/s IRA Assessment Lab, Vellore, wherein computer-based examinations

were compromised by using remote access technology. The modus operandi reveals that candidates were deliberately routed to selected examination centres, where systems were manipulated and answers were filled remotely with the aid of external operators.

7. During the course of arguments, Ld. Addl. PP argued that the role of the present applicant/accused is different from the co-accused persons, who have already been granted bail by this court and that the present applicant/accused has been arrested from Chennai i.e. near Vellore where the offence had allegedly been committed. It has further been alleged that the applicant/accused participated in the examination through the manipulated system, knowingly allowed remote access to his terminal, and even assisted in furthering the conspiracy by coordinating with co-accused persons. The investigation has revealed financial transactions and technical linkages, which are still under examination. Further, the investigation is still ongoing. Several co-accused persons are yet to be apprehended and crucial evidence, including digital devices and financial trails, is yet to be fully analyzed. Furthermore, it is a matter of record that the bail application of the present applicant/accused was dismissed by the Ld. Trial Court vide order dated 24.02.2026, and that no substantial change in circumstances has been shown to warrant a different view at this stage.

8. In the aforementioned circumstances, taking into account the gravity of the offences and the role attributed to the accused herein and the fact that the investigation of the case is

still continued as per provisions of Section 193(9) BNSS and some of the co-accused persons are yet to be arrested and also, the tampering with the evidence and influencing the prosecution witnesses cannot be ruled out, I am of the opinion that bail ought not to be granted to the accused Sparsh Chauhan at this juncture. Accordingly, the present bail application is hereby dismissed.

9. Needless to say, the above-mentioned observations are predicated solely on the facts as alleged, and brought forth at this juncture, and are not findings on merits, and would also have no bearing on the merits of the case. With these conditions, and observations, the regular bail application stands disposed of.

10. In compliance of **Sanjay Singh Vs. State (Govt of N.C.T of Delhi) Writ Petition Criminal 974/2022**, copy of this order be sent to concerned Jail Superintendent to convey the order to inmate.

11. Copy of the order be given dasti.

(Dr. TARUN SAHRAWAT)
ASJ-04 + Spl. Judge (NDPS),
South East District, Saket Court,
New Delhi /04.04.2026