



2026:CGHC:26581

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRCA No. 972 of 2026**

Krishna Sahu S/o Ramayan Sahu Aged About 22 Years R/o House No. 97, Abadi Para, Village Betar, Post Kanher, Police Outpost Khandra, Tehsil And Distt. Bemetara, Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant**versus**

State of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. Bemetara, District- Bemetara, Chhattisgarh.

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. B.P. Singh, Advocate along with Mr. Aditya Singh, Advocate

For Non-Applicant : Ms. Smriti Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****30.06.2026**

1. The applicant has preferred the present application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail, apprehending his arrest, though admittedly no First Information Report has been registered against him at Police Station City Kotwali, District Bemetara (C.G.) in connection with the alleged online financial fraud.
2. Briefly stated, the case of the applicant is that he received a notice dated 07.08.2025 issued by the Station House Officer, Police

RAHUL
DEWANGAN

Digitally
signed by
RAHUL
DEWANGAN

Station City Kotwali, Bemetara, directing him to appear before the Police Station in connection with an inquiry relating to an alleged online financial fraud. The said notice mentions Mobile No. 6232339948, which, according to the applicant, belongs to him. It is further alleged that after issuance of the said notice, the police authorities have been repeatedly visiting the applicant's residence and calling upon him to appear before them, thereby giving rise to an apprehension of arrest. Hence, the present application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated. It is submitted that the applicant has no involvement whatsoever in the alleged online financial fraud and that no criminal case or First Information Report has been registered against him. It is further submitted that although the learned trial Court rejected the applicant's earlier application for anticipatory bail, the same was not rejected on merits and the learned trial Court specifically recorded that no criminal case had been registered against the applicant. He further submits that despite the absence of any FIR, the police authorities are continuously calling the applicant and visiting his residence, causing him grave apprehension of arrest and unnecessary harassment. It is also submitted that the applicant is a labourer residing at Lucknow for the last several years and is the sole breadwinner of his family. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant be granted the protection of anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer and raises a preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of the present application. It is submitted that admittedly no FIR has been registered against the applicant and no offence has been shown to have been registered against him. It is further submitted that the applicant's earlier application for anticipatory bail was not rejected on merits by the learned trial Court. Therefore, in the absence of any registered criminal case or any order rejecting the bail application on merits, the present anticipatory bail application is not maintainable and deserves to be dismissed.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record as well as the order passed by the learned trial Court.
6. Having considered the rival submissions and the preliminary objection raised by the learned State counsel, this Court finds that admittedly no First Information Report has been registered against the applicant and even according to the applicant, his name does not figure in any criminal case. The grievance of the applicant is only that the police authorities are calling him and visiting his residence in connection with an inquiry, which has given rise to an apprehension of arrest. It is also evident from the record that the applicant's earlier application for anticipatory bail was not rejected by the learned trial Court on merits; rather, the learned trial Court recorded that no criminal case had been registered against the applicant. In such circumstances, this Court is of the considered

opinion that the present application seeking anticipatory bail is not maintainable at this stage.

7. However, it is made clear that if any occasion arises in future giving rise to a legally sustainable apprehension of arrest, it shall be open to the applicant to avail such remedy as may be available to him in accordance with law.
8. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application preferred by the applicant, **Krishna Sahu**, under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is **dismissed** as not maintainable with the aforesaid liberty.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Rahul Dewangan