



CGHC010330412026

2026:CGHC:38155

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1395 of 2026

Jitendra Kumar Yadav S/o Ganesh Yadav Aged About 29 Years Occupation - Service, Supervisor, Composite Liquor Shop, Kusmi, R/o Village - Lalmatiyapara, Kundi, P.S. - Basantpur, District - Balrampur - Ramanujganj, (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station - Kusmi, District - Balrampur - Ramanujganj (C.G.)

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	: Mr. Navneet Kumar Yadav, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	: Mr. S.S. Baghel, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order On Board

25.08.2026

1. The applicant has preferred this application under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of Anticipatory Bail, apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 63/2026, registered at Police Station – Kusmi, District – Balrampur - Ramanujganj (C.G.) for the alleged commission of offence punishable under Sections 316(5) and 318(4) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. According to the prosecution story, in brief, is that the complainant, namely Chandradeep Bhagat, who is an Excise Sub-Inspector, Circle Rajpur, conducted physical verification of the liquor stock and related

Digitally
signed by
ABHISHEK
SHRIVAS
Date:
2026.08.25
16:32:00
+0530

ABHISHEK
SHRIVAS

records of the Composite Liquor Shop, Kusmi, for the period from 01.05.2026 to 14.06.2026. During the course of the said physical verification, it was alleged that the Shop Supervisor/Applicant had received an amount of Rs. 29,74,080/- (Rupees Twenty-Nine Lakh Seventy-Four Thousand Eighty only) from the sale of liquor but had failed to deposit the said amount into the designated bank account, thereby allegedly causing wrongful loss to the Government revenue and committing fraud upon the Government. Thereafter, the Police of Police Station Kusmi registered a case bearing Crime No. 63/2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 316(5) and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) against the Applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the applicant has no criminal antecedents and that there is an unexplained delay in lodging the FIR. He further submits that the applicant was on duly sanctioned leave from 07.06.2026 to 11.06.2026, which is also reflected in the Show Cause Notice issued on 11.06.2026, and therefore, he was not present at the workplace during the relevant period. He submits that the official inspections conducted on 08.04.2026 and 11.06.2026 found the stock to be correct and sufficient, whereas the prosecution has subsequently alleged shortage and misappropriation. He further submits that the disputed Stock Take Report and bank deposit slips contain the applicant's signatures despite his absence from the workplace, which creates serious doubt regarding the prosecution case and indicates manipulation of records. It is also submitted that the applicant had raised complaints regarding irregularities and the role of other officers, but instead of conducting a fair investigation, he has been falsely implicated. The entire case is based upon documentary evidence,

which is already in possession of the investigating agency, and custodial interrogation is not required. The applicant is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State Counsel opposes the bail application and submits that during physical verification of the liquor stock and records, a sum of Rs. 29,74,080/- was found to have been received from the sale of liquor but not deposited in the designated bank account, thereby causing wrongful loss to the Government revenue. He further submits that the applicant, being the Shop Supervisor, is directly responsible for the alleged misappropriation and fraud. Hence, considering the serious nature of the allegations, he prays for rejection of the bail application.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.
6. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, particularly the alleged misappropriation of Rs. 29,74,080/- of Government revenue, and the specific role attributed to the applicant as the Shop Supervisor, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant has not made out a case for grant of bail.
7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant – **Jitendra Kumar Yadav**, involved in Crime No. 63/2026, registered at Police Station – Kusmi, District – Balrampur - Ramanujganj (C.G.) for the alleged commission of offence punishable under Sections 316(5) and 318(4) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, is **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice