



CGHC010316482026

2026:CGHC:38308

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
MCRCA No. 1419 of 2026

Lakshit Kumar S/o Manoj Kumar Aged About 22 Years R/o Mehendipur
 Sonipat, Sonipat (Haryana)

... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Chakarbhata, District –
 Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

... Non-applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Janu Khare, Advocate.

For Non-applicant/State : Mr. Sumit Singh, Dy. Advocate General.

RAJSHEKHAR
SONI

Digitally signed
by
RAJSHEKHAR
SONI

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Order On Board

31.08.2026

1. The applicant has preferred this anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of Anticipatory Bail, apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 180/2026, registered at Police Station – Chakarbhata, District – Bilaspur (C.G.) for alleged commission of offence punishable under Section 318(4), 336(3), 340(2), 61(2), 338 and 3(5) of the BNS and Section 66(D) of the IT Act.

2. As per the prosecution story in brief, is that the complainant/applicant, Arvind Sinha, lodged a written complaint at Police Station Chakrabhatha alleging that on 10.06.2024, one Grace David, stated to be a resident of the United Kingdom, presented a Demand Draft of Rs.103 Crores in his name at Union Bank of India, City Branch, Airport, Delhi. The said Demand Draft was allegedly subjected to verification by

the Union Bank of India, Customs Department, Union Bank of India, Karol Bagh, Delhi, the Enforcement Directorate, Delhi, and the Reserve Bank of India, Delhi. It is further alleged that, for the purpose of getting the aforesaid Demand Draft of Rs.103 Crores cleared, the accused persons, namely, Naveen Kumar June, Pragya Srivastava and their relatives and associates, using mobile number 8950235050, created various fake e-mail IDs and represented to the complainant that he was required to deposit an amount of Rs.3,13,13,850/-, failing which the Demand Draft would be cancelled. Believing the aforesaid representation to be genuine, the complainant, through his wife and daughter, deposited a total amount of Rs.3,13,13,850/- in the accounts communicated to him, maintained with the State Bank of India, High Court Branch, and HDFC Bank, Bengaluru, and also made certain payments through credit cards. Subsequently, when the complainant was informed by a bank official that the Demand Draft had reached the Bank of India, he contacted accused Naveen June. The accused allegedly informed him that the aforesaid amount had been deposited with the bank towards service charges.

3. On the basis of the written complaint lodged by the complainant, an offence under Sections 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 66-D of the Information Technology Act was registered against accused Naveen June and Pragya Srivastava. During the course of investigation, on the basis of the statement of the complainant and the documents produced by him, Sections 336(3), 338, 340(2), 61(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 were subsequently added. During investigation, on the basis of the

memorandum statement of accused Naveen June, a laptop, tablet, mobile phone, Aadhaar Card, PAN Card and cheque book were seized from his possession. Upon finding prima facie material showing his involvement in the alleged offence of cheating committed pursuant to a conspiracy, accused Naveen June was arrested on 03.04.2026. From the perusal of the case diary, it is alleged that accused Naveen June, in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy, induced the complainant Arvind Sinha to deposit an amount of Rs.3,13,13,850/- for getting the Demand Draft of Rs.103 Crores cleared. By allegedly creating fake e-mail IDs and making false representations, the said amount was fraudulently procured from the complainant and transferred/deposited into various bank accounts belonging to the co-accused persons. Hence, this application.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant has argued that two of the co-accused persons, namely, Pragya Shrivastava, Ishika, Azad Singh and Vishnu Sihora alias Vishal have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders dated 07.05.2026 and 29.07.2026 passed in MCRCA Nos. 687/2026 and 1161/2026. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant.
5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submitted that so far as the anticipatory bail granted to the co-accused, namely, Pragya Shrivastava is concerned, she was granted anticipatory bail by this Court on the ground of being a lady. It is contended that the applicant, in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy with the co-accused persons, was involved in inducing the complainant to deposit a huge amount of Rs.3,13,13,850/- on the false

pretext of getting a Demand Draft of Rs.103 Crores cleared. It is further submitted that fake e-mail IDs were created and used for making false representations to the complainant, pursuant to which the aforesaid amount was transferred into various bank accounts of the co-accused persons. Learned State counsel further submits that the investigation has revealed the involvement of the applicant in the alleged conspiracy and that the money trail is required to be investigated thoroughly. It is argued that custodial interrogation of the applicant is necessary for ascertaining the role played by him, tracing the proceeds of the alleged crime, identifying the other persons involved in the conspiracy and collecting further evidence. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the huge amount allegedly obtained by fraudulent means and the material collected during investigation, learned State counsel submits that the applicant does not deserve the benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
7. Considering the facts & circumstances of the case, allegations levelled against the applicant in the FIR, it appears that so far as the anticipatory bail granted to the co-accused, namely, Pragya Shrivastava is concerned, she was granted anticipatory bail by this Court on the ground of being a lady, moreover, the applicant was involved in the alleged conspiracy whereby, on the pretext of getting a Demand Draft of Rs.103 Crores cleared, the complainant was induced to deposit a huge amount of Rs.3,13,13,850/-. It is further alleged that fake e-mail IDs were created and used for making false

representations to the complainant, pursuant to which the aforesaid amount was transferred into various bank accounts of the co-accused persons. The investigation in respect of the money trail and the respective roles of the persons involved is still required to be carried out. At this stage, the possibility of the applicant's custodial interrogation for ascertaining his precise role, tracing the proceeds of the alleged crime and identifying the other persons involved in the conspiracy cannot be ruled out. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the magnitude of the alleged financial fraud, the amount involved and the material collected during investigation, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant is not entitled for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, the Anticipatory Bail application of the applicant – **Lakshit Kumar**, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 in connection with Crime No. 180/2026, registered at Police Station – Chakarbhata, District – Bilaspur (C.G.) for alleged commission of offence punishable under Section 318(4), 336(3), 340(2), 61(2), 338 and 3(5) of the BNS and Section 66(D) of the IT Act, is **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Rajshekhar