



CGHC010264432026

2026:CGHC:29380

NAFR

Digitally
signed by
VAISHALI
LUCKY
NAGARIA
Date:
2026.07.15
11:54:31
+0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1087 of 2026

- Aniruddh Singh Aatram S/o Late Mahendra Singh Aatram Aged About 21 Years R/o Opposite Talwar Bhawan, House No. 494, Subhash Nagar, Durg, District- Durg (C.G.)

... Applicant(s)**versus**

- State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Padmanabhpur, District- Durg (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant(s)	: Mr. Avinash Chand Sahu, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	: Mr. Shaleen Singh Baghel, Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

13/07/2026

1. This first anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed by the applicant, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.303/2026 registered at Police Station – Padmanabhpur, District: Durg, (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4) and 61(2) of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023.
2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the complainant Himanshu Devangan, lodged a written complaint before Police Station Padmanabhpur, District - Durg, alleging that he had come into

contact with the present applicant through one Gajendra Sahu, who introduced him to a scheme whereby electronic goods were to be purchased on EMI finance and thereafter sold at a higher price, assuring that the purchaser would receive commission while the EMIs would be regularly paid by the persons operating the scheme. on the assurance of Gajendra Sahu, the complainant furnished copies of his PAN Card and Aadhaar Card and was paid a commission of Rs.500/-. Thereafter, electronic articles including an iPhone and other household items were purchased through Bajaj Finance in the name of the complainant. It is further alleged that Gajendra Sahu, the principal accused Rishabh Sharma, the present applicant and certain other persons assured the complainant that they would regularly pay the EMIs and that the electronic goods would be sold at a profit. According to the complainant, acting on such assurances, he continued purchasing electronic goods through finance facilities availed in his name and the articles were allegedly handed over to the accused persons for sale. Subsequently, the EMIs allegedly remained unpaid, where-after the finance company issued legal notices to the complainant. On coming to know about the alleged fraud, the complainant lodged the present report. Hence, this bail application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further contended that the applicant himself is a victim of the conspiracy allegedly conspired by the principal accused, Rishabh Sharma, who induced several persons into the alleged transaction. Prior to registration of the present FIR, the applicant himself had attempted to lodge a complaint before the concerned Police Station against the

said accused. As no action was taken by the police, he was constrained to send a written complaint through registered post. Copies of the complaint along with the postal receipt are being filed as ANNEXURE A/3. He further submits that applicant has only one criminal antecedent, therefore, he submits that the present applicant is also entitled to be released on anticipatory bail .

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, appearing for the non - applicant/State, opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant and submits that applicant has one criminal antecedent of the year 2026. He also submits that the present applicant is an active participant in a well-organized conspiracy to cheat innocent persons by inducing them to purchase electronic goods on finance under the false assurance that the EMIs would be regularly paid and that the goods would be sold at a profit, with commission being paid to the purchasers. It is submitted that the complainant was lured into the scheme through co-accused Gajendra Sahu, who introduced him to the present applicant and other accused persons. Acting on their inducement and assurances, the complainant furnished his identity documents and availed finance facilities in his own name for the purchase of costly electronic articles, including an iPhone and other household appliances, which were thereafter handed over to the accused persons, therefore he is not entitled for anticipatory bail.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials available on record.
6. Considering the facts & circumstances of the case, submission of learned counsel for the parties, materials available on record, considering the fact that complainant was induced by the present

applicant along with the co-accused to purchase electronic goods on finance in his own name on the false assurance that the EMIs would be regularly paid and the goods would be sold at a profit, while the complainant would receive commission. Acting upon such inducement, the complainant availed finance facilities by furnishing his identity documents, purchased costly electronic articles, and handed them over to the accused persons. Thereafter, the accused persons allegedly failed to pay the EMIs, resulting in legal notices being issued by the finance company to the complainant, at this stage, the allegations prima facie disclose the active involvement of the present applicant in the commission of the alleged offence. Further, having regard to the nature and gravity of the accusations, the manner in which the alleged offence has been committed, the material collected during investigation, this Court is not inclined to extend the benefit of bail to the applicant.

7. Accordingly, this bail application of applicant – **Aniruddh Singh Aatram**, involved in Crime No.303/2026 registered at Police Station – Padmanabhpur, District: Durg, (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4) and 61(2) of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023, is **rejected** at this stage.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Vaishali