CGHC010325252026 2026:CGHC:43577

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 7788 of 2026

1 - Amey @ Gopa Shrivastav S/o Naveen Shrivastav Aged About 29 Years R/o Banspara, Dhamtari, P.S. City Kotwali, Dhamtari, District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

--- **Applicant**

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station- City Kotwali, Dhamtari, District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

--- **Non-applicant**

For Applicant	**:**	Mr. Shobhit Koshta, Advocate
For Non-applicant /State	**:**	Mr. Keshav Gupta, G.A.

MCRC No. 8329 of 2026

1 - Vicky Ahmad Son Of Mohammad Shafique Kuraishi Aged About 40 Years Resident Of Islam Nagar Supela, Bhilai, Police Station Supela, Tahsil And District Durg (C.G.)

---**Applicant**

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Of Police Station City Kotwali Dhamtari, District Dhamtari (C.G.)

--- **Non-applicant**

For Applicant	**:**	Mr. Jitendra Gupta, Advocate
For Non-applicant /State	**:**	Mr. Keshav Gupta, G.A.

MCRC No. 8295 of 2026

1 - Gaurav Sharma S/o Mahendra Sharma Aged About 35 Years R/o Sihawa, Road, (Wrongly Mentioned, Sihawa Roas), Makeshwar Ward, Dhamtari, Tehsil And District Dhamtari, (C. G.)

---Applicant

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Police Station City, Kotwali, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari, (C. G.)

--- Non-applicant

For Applicant	**:**	Mr. Hemant Kumar Agrawal, Advocate
For Non-applicant /State	**:**	Mr. Keshav Gupta, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

08/10/2026

1. Since these three criminal appeals arise out of the same Crime No., therefore, they are being heard together and are being disposed of by this common order

2. The applicants herein have preferred these first bail applications under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail as they have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 118/2026 registered at Police Station City Kotwali, District Dhamtari (C.G.) for the following offences :-

Applicant/Accused	**Sections Invoked**
Amey @ Gopa Shrivatav	Under Sections 318(4), 61(2), 112(2) and 3(5) of BNS and Section 66(c) of the IT Act.
Vicky Ahmad	Under Sections 318(4), 61(2), 112 of BNS and Sections 66(C) and 66(D) of the IT Act.
Gaurav Sharma	Under Sections 318(4), 61(2) and 112 of BNS and Section 66(C) of the IT Act.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the applicants, in connivance with other co-accused persons, allegedly induced ten victims in District Dhamtari to open bank accounts on the pretext of providing loans and thereafter, obtained their passbooks and ATM cards for facilitating online financial fraud. It is alleged that UPI transactions amounting to approximately ₹1,15,69,710/- were deposited through the said accounts with withdrawals amounting to approximately ₹1,15,69,818/-. Accordingly, the above-stated offences were registered against the present applicants.

4. Mr. Shobhit Koshta, learned counsel appearing for the applicant – Amey @ Gopa Shrivastav, would submit that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. He would further submit that the allegation against the present applicant is that he opened the bank accounts of various persons

and gave information about the same to co-accused Vicky Ahmad who in turn used the said bank accounts as mule accounts and the applicant herein was given commission for the same, however, there is no direct evidence against the applicant connecting him with the crime in question. He would also submit that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedent, charge-sheet has already been filed and the applicant has been in judicial custody since 01/05/2026, and since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time, the applicant may be enlarged on regular bail.

5. Mr. Jitendra Gupta, learned counsel appearing for the applicant – Vicky Ahmad, would submit that the applicant has falsely been implicated in the crime in question. He would further submit that some material and other important witnesses have been examined before the trial Court and they have not supported the case of the prosecution. He would further submit that there is no previous criminal antecedent of the applicant, charge-sheet has been filed and the applicant is in jail since 02/05/2026 and since conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time, therefore, the applicant may be released on bail.

6. Mr. Hemant Kumar Agrawal, learned counsel for the applicant – Gaurav Sharma, would submit that there is no direct evidence against the applicant which connects him with the commission of the crime in question. He would further submit that key seizure and memorandum witnesses have failed to identify the present applicant and have not supported the case of the prosecution at

all. He would lastly submit that the applicant has no criminal antecedent, charge-sheet has been filed and the applicant is in jail since 30/04/2026, therefore, he may be released on bail.

7. On the other hand, Ms. Keshav Gupta, learned counsel appearing for the non-applicant/State, would oppose the bail application and submit that applicants Amey @ Gopa Shrivastav and Vicky Ahmad are main accused persons and have played an active role in commission of the crime in question. He would further submit that serious allegations of committing cyber fraud has been levelled against the applicants. It is alleged that the applicants, in connivance with other co-accused persons, induced victims to open bank accounts on the pretext of arranging loans and thereafter, misused the said accounts for carrying out fraudulent online financial transactions. Thus, he would pray for rejection of these bail applications.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.

9. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the serious allegations which indicate the prima facie involvement of the applicants herein in a coordinated scheme involving the procurement and use of bank accounts belonging to several persons, the routing of substantial amounts through those accounts, and the alleged receipt of proceeds connected with fraudulent online transactions and further considering the seriousness of the alleged offence, the magnitude of the amount involved, the active role of the applicants in commission of the crime in question which is

supported by technical evidence including call detail records of the applicants as well as active cyber fraud complaints involving transactions in these mule accounts which link the accounts seized from the applicants directly to fraudulent transactions, I am not inclined to grant bail to the present applicants.

10. Accordingly, these bail applications are hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)

JUDGE

Harneet