CGHC010337332026 2026:CGHC:44286

NAFR

PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Digitally signed by PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Date: 2026.10.13 18:12:13 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1509 of 2026

- Hemant Soni S/o Kanhaiya Lal Soni Aged About 30 Years Resident Of Satigudi Chowk, Baikunthpur, Police Station- City Kotwali, Tahsil And District- Raigarh (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Incharge, Cyber Police Station, Raigarh, District- Raigarh (C.G.)

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Sangeet Kumar Kushwaha, Advocate
For Respondent-State	:	Mr. Sumit Singh, Dy. Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

ORDER ON BOARD

13/10/2026

1. Applicant has preferred this application under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail as he apprehends his arrest in connection with Crime No. 04/2026 registered at Police Station- Cyber Police Station, District Raigarh (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 61(2), 316(2), 112(2), 319(2), 318(2), 338, 336(3), 336(4), 340(2) of BNS, Section 66(C) , 66(D) of the Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008.

2. Case of prosecution, in brief, is that the complainant, Ramkumar Shukla, lodged a written report at Police Station Cyber, District Raigarh, stating that he worked as an auto driver. In the month of November, he visited Nidhi Parivahan Kendra at Darogapara, Raigarh, along with other persons engaged in preparing driving licences, where he found that the centre was allegedly involved in preparing forged documents, including

driving licences, Aadhaar cards, PAN cards, mark sheets, marriage certificates, caste certificates and other official records. It was further alleged that the accused persons, namely Kapil Garg, Nidhi Garg, Himanshu Mehar and Hemant Soni (applicant), operated the Nidhi Parivahan Kendra and Shantidevi Shiksha Society, where separate rooms were used for preparing forged documents, editing videos for uploading on YouTube, and running a call centre to contact people and extort money on the pretext of arranging marriages. The accused allegedly fabricated electronic records and forged signatures, stamps and seals of various government departments and authorities, including revenue officials, schools, municipal corporations, railways and Anganwadi centres, to prepare counterfeit documents and cheat people for monetary gain.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the allegation levelled against applicant is false and baseless. Applicant is not involved in the crime as alleged against him. The matrimonial site is being run by Nidhi Garg and Kapil Garg. Applicant handles RTO related works and also insurance agent. Out of 26 accused persons, 25 have been granted regular bail. Hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the submission of counsel for applicant and would submit that according to the material available in the case diary, applicant along with Kapil Garg are running the matrimonial site, however, in the garb of matrimonial site, they are running a call centre in which girls have been engaged. They were also preparing forged documents of RTO, caste certificates etc. as it appearing from the memorandum statement of co-accused persons who have already been arrested. He further submits that after arrest of other co-accused persons, material have been collected by the police. There is no requirement of custodial interrogation.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for applicant submits that during investigation, all the materials have been collected and further interrogation of the applicant is also unnecessary.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the documents enclosed along with bail application.

7. Taking into consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation, submission of learned counsel for the parties, manner in which the offence is said to be committed of running call centre, I do not find present to be a fit case to allow this application.

8. Accordingly, this anticipatory bail application is **rejected**.

Sd/-

(**Parth Prateem Sahu**)
JUDGE

pwn