



RAJIV GANDHI NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LAW, PUNJAB

PRESENTS

14TH NATIONAL MOOT COURT COMPETITION 2026

organised by

**RGNUL MOOT COURT COMMITTEE
&
CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN
CRIMINAL LAW**

Dates:

Online Rounds : 4th April, 2026

**Advanced Rounds : 17th April & 18th
April, 2026**

MOOT PROPOSITION

Moot Proposition¹ | 14th RGNUL National Moot Court Competition, 2026

1. Saint Education School, Gurugram (**‘SES’**) is a recognized private school situated in Gurugram, Haryana. It is owned and governed by the Saint Education Society (**‘the Society’**), a registered non-profit established in 1949 under the Societies Registration Act, 1860. The Society currently owns and operates 15 schools across India under the brand name “Saint Education School”, with the earliest school operating since 1950.
2. In the year 2005, the Society was approached by the Haryana Urban Development Authority (**‘HUDA’**), now known as the Haryana Shahari Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP), to open a school in Gurugram. At the time, the Government of Haryana was keen on having good quality and reputed schools set up in Gurugram— an area that the Government wished to develop as a model city for the State. In view of this, HUDA offered to sell a 10-acre plot of Government land located within Gurugram to the Society for the construction of the new school at a price which was 25% less than the market rate at the time. Upon receiving the offer, the President of the Society, Mr. Francis George, was overjoyed, and the Society did not only purchase the land, but also included the Chief Minister of the State of Haryana as a member of the Society. Ever since then, Mr. George has ensured that the sitting chief minister of Haryana is always included as a member of the Society. The chief ministers have regularly attended annual functions, sports days and other special events of SES, Gurugram. The Chief Minister, as an ex-officio member of the Society, possessed voting rights in matters relating to expansion, infrastructure and financial approvals.
3. According to applicable state policy, SES, Gurugram was obligated to reserve 25% of the seats for students from Economically Weaker Sections (EWS) on the property granted by HUDA. Additionally, the school was expected to submit yearly compliance reports to the State Education Department.
4. Over the years, SES, Gurugram has earned the reputation of being one of the most exclusive schools in the country, with the annual fee for each student ranging between INR 15,00,000/- (Rupees fifteen lakhs only) to INR 20,00,000/- (Rupees twenty lakhs only)

¹ The facts and names provided in this moot proposition are entirely fictional. Undisputed facts stated in the proposition are to be assumed to be true and participants are not to assume any facts inconsistent therewith. While the names of cities, states and courts of India have been used to keep the proposition realistic, all actions attributed to them in this proposition are entirely fictitious. Names of people, schools, etc. are fictitious.

depending on the year of schooling. Known for its world-class infrastructure and highly qualified teachers, SES, Gurugram meets its expenses exclusively through collected fees and alumni donations. Despite the high fee, each year, hundreds of parents apply to have their young kids admitted to the school in the first grade (Class 1) as it becomes increasingly difficult to obtain admission in later classes. However, since SES, Gurugram admits only 300 students in any grade, every year most applicants fail to obtain admission for their kids.

5. As per school policy, all admission applications for an academic year must be submitted to SES' admissions office latest by the first day of February. Mr. Karan Khurana, a business tycoon, wanted to admit his daughter, Myra, to the school, but was able to come down to the admissions office with the filled application form only on 2nd February 2024. During the visit, he met the Admissions Manager of SES, Mr. Prakash Chopra, and one Ms. Nalini Saini, who was also there to submit her daughter's application for admission. Mr. Chopra was responsible for receiving and vetting all admission applications for SES, Gurugram, and transmitting the eligible applications to the Admissions Committee of SES, Gurugram, which consisted of the principal of the school, senior teachers and Society members. The Committee was headed by the President of the Society. Mr. Chopra was responsible for preliminary scrutiny of applications; he had no independent authority to grant admissions and could only forward applications to the Admissions Committee with remarks.
6. While Mr. Chopra initially refused to accept the application forms of both parents citing the lapsed deadline of 1st February 2024, upon requests for an exception, Mr. Chopra allegedly offered to back-date the filing of the applications if each of them paid INR 10 lakhs in cash by 3rd February 2024.
7. Ms. Saini left the meeting and immediately approached Mr. Sunny Brar, an acquaintance who worked as an inspector in the office of the Superintendent of Police, State Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Bureau (SVACB), Gurugram, and informed him of the events that transpired. In the evening, before Mr. Chopra returned from work, acting without prior judicial authorization but on the basis of specific information received from Ms. Saini, Inspector Brar installed remote listening devices in the apartment corridor adjacent to Mr. Chopra's flat. On the evening of 3rd February 2024, the bugs planted in the apartment recorded the following conversation between Mr. Chopra and Mr. Khurana:

Transcript of the Recorded Conversation:

Date: 3rd February 2024

Time: 6:30 PM - 6:45 PM

Mr. Khurana: *I hope you will be able to ensure that my child gets admission to SES.*

Mr. Chopra: *I will ensure that the application is backdated and filed. The decision on admission is taken by the Admissions Committee, but there is nothing to worry. Myra's application will go through.*

Mr. Khurana: *Good. Thank you. I will be leaving now. I am keeping this bag here. It has ten lakh rupees.*

Mr. Chopra: *Thank you. Will speak to you soon.*

—End of Recording—

8. On the same night, Inspector Brar went to the Superintendent of Police, SVACB, Gurugram with the recording and informed him of what had transpired. The Superintendent of Police severely admonished Inspector Brar, relieved him of active duty with immediate effect, and brought Ms. Saini to the station. Ms. Nalini Saini and Mr. Sunny Brar's accounts of events were recorded and an FIR lodged with the SVACB, Gurugram against both Mr. Chopra and Mr. Khurana.
9. On the morning of 5th February 2024, a team led by the Superintendent of Police raided the apartment of Mr. Chopra, arrested him under charges of an offence under Section 7, Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, and executed a search warrant permitting search and seizure of all documents and other materials in the apartment which may be relevant to the investigations. A bag containing INR 10 lakhs was recovered from the residence. The team, *inter alia*, seized Mr. Chopra's laptop and ordered him to type in his password and unlock the device. However, Mr. Chopra refused to do so. Over the course of the day, SVACB's officers were able to compel Mr. Chopra to share the password; the officers informed Mr. Chopra that non-cooperation may attract adverse legal consequences under applicable law. Witness testimony and CCTV audio-visuals of the interrogation carried out in the residence of Mr. Chopra were later presented during trial and they established that the police officers threatened that Mr. Chopra would be punished for more severe offences than bribery if he refused to share his laptop's password, including under the infamous

Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967. No physical violence was used during the interrogation, which was video recorded.

10. The laptop contained files which showed that Mr. Chopra held a small fortune in cryptocurrencies, with the total value estimated to be upward of INR 2 crores. The private keys for the cryptocurrencies were stored in the hard drive of the laptop. Given Mr. Chopra's monthly salary of just INR 40,000/- per month and in the absence of any other known sources of income, the SVACB added charges under Section 13(1)(b), Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.
11. During the raid, the police also seized the mobile phone of Mr. Chopra, which was locked using biometrics. The police physically forced Mr. Chopra to place his right, index finger on the mobile's fingerprint scanner to open the phone. Thereafter, the police opened the WhatsApp application installed on the phone and checked Mr. Chopra's recent correspondence. Much to the surprise of the police team, they found the following WhatsApp message sent to the principal of the school, Ms. Neha Gupta:

Date: 3rd February 2024

Time: 7:30 PM

Message Text: *Hi, ma'am! Mr. Karan Khurana came over and handed the application for his daughter to me. Let Mr. George know. Will bring the money next Friday when we meet at the club?*

Ms. Neha Gupta had seen and reacted with the 'thumbs up' emoji

The investigating officers recorded in the case diary that biometric unlocking constituted physical evidence.

12. On basis of this message, the SVACB police team obtained a warrant to search Ms. Gupta's residence as well as her office on the premises of SES, Gurugram. During the raid conducted on the evening of 5th February 2024, the police team arrested her for the suspected commission of an offence under Section 7 read with Section 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. While no cash or other incriminating material was found from her residence or office, the police was able to recover and seize the final compilation of admission applications received by SES, Gurugram by 1st February 2024, and found Ms. Myra Khurana's application dated 1st February 2024 in the compilation.

13. Mr. Khurana was informed of the arrests and the FIR against him on the morning of 6th February 2026 and interrogated at his residence. He denied bribing Mr. Chopra and also denied meeting him at his residence. He claimed that he had submitted Myra's admission application on 1st February 2024 and denied Ms. Saini's account entirely. He stated that his visit to Mr. Chopra's office in SES, Gurugram on 2nd February 2024 was just to enquire about further admission formalities and an inspection of the school premises to ensure it meets his expectations.
14. Despite the successful raids based on information obtained by Inspector Brar, disciplinary action was initiated against him for flouting the police rules and for trespassing into Mr. Chopra's residence. Upon the enquiry revealing unlawful conduct on part of Mr. Brar, he was suspended from duty for twelve months.
15. On 15th March 2024, a chargesheet was filed before the Additional District and Sessions, Gurugram (designated as a Special Judge) naming Mr. Prakash Chopra, Ms. Neha Gupta and Mr. Karan Khurana as accused persons under The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. Since there was no evidence against Mr. Francis George, apart from Mr. Chopra's message to Ms. Gupta mentioning him, he was not accused in the chargesheet.
16. The judge took cognizance of the matter and proceeded to frame charges against the accused persons based on the chargesheet. The matter proceeded to trial, and all three individuals were convicted. In its final judgment dated 10th October 2025, the trial court rendered the following findings:
 - (i) The witness testimony of Ms. Nalini Saini and Mr. Sunny Brar, both of whom were examined as prosecution's witnesses, inspired confidence and was consistent with contents of the FIR.
 - (ii) The voice recordings relied upon by the police and the prosecution were obtained through the illegal actions of Inspector Brar but were nevertheless relevant and admissible under law in the present proceedings.
 - (iii) The aforesaid voice recordings were genuine, and the voices recorded therein belonged to Mr. Chopra and Mr. Khurana. Several witnesses were examined on this issue which proved this beyond reasonable doubt.

- (iv) Mr. Chopra and Ms. Gupta were both amenable to the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and had violated the same on multiple counts.
- (v) Mr. Chopra had accepted a bribe of INR 10 lakhs from Mr. Khurana, which was corroborated not only by the FIR lodged by Ms. Saini, who also testified as a witness in the trial, but was also clearly proven by the voice recordings. The amount was taken as an inducement to facilitate the admission of Mr. Khurana's daughter to SES, Gurugram in an unlawful and corrupt manner in violation of school admission rules. The recovery of INR 10 lakhs from the residential home of Mr. Chopra by the SVACB during the raid further corroborated this. Therefore, Mr. Chopra had committed an offence under Section 7, The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.
- (vi) There was nothing wrong in the police compelling Mr Chopra to unlock his mobile phone using his fingerprint and the evidence obtained through this process, including his conversation with Ms. Neha Gupta, the school principal, was admissible in evidence.
- (vii) Ms. Neha Gupta had abetted the offence under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 committed by Mr. Chopra.
- (viii) There was nothing wrong in the police compelling Mr. Chopra to share the password of his laptop to facilitate the investigation process and the evidence of possession of cryptocurrencies obtained in that manner were admissible and relevant.
- (ix) Mr. Chopra was in possession of financial resources in excess of known sources of income, including around INR 2 crores in cryptocurrency and an offence under Section 13(1)(b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 was made out against him even without knowledge of the exact deeds committed to gain such financial resources.
- (x) Mr. Khurana had bribed Mr. Chopra and his actions amounted to inducing a public servant to perform a public duty improperly. Therefore, Mr. Khurana

had committed an offence under Section 8, Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

17. Thus, the court sentenced Mr. Chopra to five (5) years of imprisonment along with fine to the tune of INR 1 lakh. Ms. Gupta was sentenced to three (3) years of imprisonment and a fine of INR 50,000/-. Mr. Khurana was also convicted under Section 8. The court directed Mr. Khurana to pay a fine of INR 5 lakhs but did not sentence him to imprisonment.
18. Mr. Chopra, Ms. Gupta and Mr. Khurana challenged the judgment dated 10th October 2025 before the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh on several grounds ('the High Court'). The Appellants contended that Mr. Chopra and Ms. Gupta were not amenable to the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. Moreover, the sound recordings and evidence obtained from the laptop and mobile phone of Mr. Chopra were inadmissible as they were illegally obtained. Before the High Court, the Appellants, for the first time, also raised the issue that the investigation and prosecution were illegal as requisite sanctions had not been obtained under Section 17A and Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.
19. In its judgment dated 16th of February 2026, the High Court allowed the appeal and overturned both the convictions holding—
 - (i) Mr. Chopra & Ms. Gupta were not amenable to the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and therefore, no crime under the Act could be established against them or Mr. Khurana.
 - (ii) The sound recordings and evidence obtained from the mobile phone and laptop of Mr. Chopra were unlawfully obtained and were also in breach of privacy rights. Therefore, the said materials were inadmissible in evidence. In the absence of these materials, the conviction of the Appellants could not be sustained.
 - (iii) The investigations and the prosecution were bad in law as they were commenced without requisite sanctions under Section 17-A and Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, respectively.

20. Against the aforesaid judgment of the High Court, an appeal has been filed by the State of Haryana before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India challenging all three of the abovementioned findings of the High Court. The Supreme Court has admitted the appeal, given the importance of the issues raised, the matter has been referred to a 5-judge bench before which it is now fixed for final hearing on the following issues:

Issue 1: Whether Mr. Chopra & Ms. Gupta are amenable to the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988

Issue 2: Whether the illegally obtained sound recordings were admissible in evidence?

Issue 3: Whether the police acted unlawfully in compelling Mr. Prakash Chopra to share his laptop password and unlock his mobile phone during police investigations, and if so, to what effect?

Issue 4: Whether prior sanction for prosecution under Section 19 and Section 17-A of The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 was mandatory in the facts and circumstances of the present case, and if so, to what effect?

Participating teams are required to submit written memorials/submissions and prepare oral arguments for each side.

~.~