



CGHC010381642026



2026:CGHC:44707

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9240 of 2026

Aagman Minj S/o Goshner Minj, Aged About 32 Years R/o Kubdahal Police Station Tumla, Fharsabahar, District - Jashpur (C.G.)

... **Applicant(s)**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer (S H O), Police Station Kansabel, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)

... **Non-Applicant(s)**

For Applicant : Mr. Shikhar Agnihotri, Advocate.

For Non-Applicant/State : Mr. Keshav Gupta, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

15/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this first bail application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 99/2025 registered at Police Station Kansabel, District Jashpur (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 319(2) and 317(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 66-D of the Information Technology Act, 2000.
2. The prosecution story, in brief, is that the complainant, Ram Niwas

Ram, lodged an FIR on 08.08.2025 alleging that an unknown person had withdrawn an amount of Rs. 29,15,000/- without any authorisation from the bank accounts of the complainant, his wife and daughter. On the basis of the complaint, the police registered the aforesaid offences and during the course of investigation, arrested the applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the matter has already been settled between the applicant and the complainant and the aforesaid amount of Rs. 29,15,000/- has been refunded to the complainant. He would further submit that the complainant has not supported the prosecution case before the learned Court below. He would also submit that similarly situated co-accused Saffar Ansari has been granted bail by this Court in MCRC No. 8341 of 2026, vide order dated 22.09.2026 and the case of the applicant stands on the same footing. Therefore, the applicant may also be enlarged on bail on the ground of parity.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant of bail and submit that considering the nature of the allegations, the applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.
5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that similarly situated co-accused Saffar Ansari has been granted bail by this Court in MCRC No. 8341 of 2026, vide order dated 22.09.2026 and the submissions that the matter

has been settled between the applicant and the complainant, the amount in question has been refunded, thus without further commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the applicant on the ground of parity.

7. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant is **allowed**. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

- (i) he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such fact to the Court;
- (ii) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, &
- (iii) he shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

**Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge**