CGHC010342682026 2026:CGHC:43424

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8217 of 2026

Satyaprakash Pandey S/o Late Ramnagina Pandey Aged About 71 Years R/o Sai Nagar Colony, Jora, Krishak Nagar Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station A.C.B./ E.O.W. Branch A.C.B. Office, Ambikapur, District Sarguja Chhattisgarh (F.I.R. Register At P.S. A.C.B./ E.O.W., Raipur C.G.) **... Non-Applicant**

Digitally signed by ALLENA ANJANI KUMAR
Date: 2026.10.08 10:10:56 +0530

For Applicant	:	Shri Rajeev Shrivasstava, learned Senior Advocate with Ms. Sakshi Chhabra, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	:	Shri Praveen Das, Additional Advocate General

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAKESH MOHAN PANDEY)

Order on Board

07/10/2026

1. This is the **First bail application** filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.28/2017 registered at Police Station ACB/EOW, Distt. Raipur (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Section 13(1)(d) and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and under Sections 409, 420, 120-B of IPC.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, a written report was lodged by Shri Brihaspat Singh, MLA of Ramanujganj making allegations of corruption

in purchase of furniture in Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Surguja, on 27.08.2015, at the State Economic Offences Investigation and Anti-Corruption Bureau, Raipur. Subsequently, enquiry was conducted by Deputy Superintendent of Police and it was found that Rs.2.70 crores was received in the year 2010-2011 for purchase of furniture for middle schools and in pursuance thereof, purchase orders worth Rs.2,68,18,838/- were issued to ten private firms. It was also found that the Project Coordinator and the Collector-cum-Mission Director issued 10 cheques to various firms against purchase of furniture without physical verification. The applicant herein, who was Project Coordinator, got retired from service on 31.12.2016 and thereafter an F.I.R. was registered on 29.09.2017.

3. Shri Rajeev Shrivastava, learned Senior Counsel for the applicant would submit that departmental enquiry was initiated against the present applicant and when no decision was taken, a writ petition was filed before the High Court seeking direction to the disciplinary authority and enquiry officer to conclude the departmental proceedings at the earliest. He would further submit that though the applicant was staying in Raipur but no attempt was made by the police officials with regard to arrest of the present applicant. He would contend that the present applicant was taken into custody on 19.08.2026 and since then he is in jail. It is also argued that there is no allegation that the present applicant has received any financial benefit/gain from the alleged transaction or issuance of 10 cheques. He would further contend that the applicant has no criminal antecedents and further, conclusion of the trial is likely to take some considerable time. Therefore, he would

pray that the bail application may be allowed and the applicant may be enlarged on bail.

4. On the other hand, Shri Praveen Das, learned counsel for the State would oppose the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant. He would submit that present applicant, who was discharging functions of District Project Coordinator, got signatures of the then Collector on 10 cheques and issued them to 10 firms without physical verification of supply. He would contend that as the present applicant was negligent and there was procedural lapse on his part, therefore, F.I.R. was lodged. He would further contend that the applicant remained absconded for a long period of 9 years, and therefore, the bail application deserves to be rejected.

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

6. Having considered the fact that departmental enquiry was pending against the applicant; when no decision was taken on departmental enquiry, a writ petition was filed by the applicant wherein direction was issued on 18.01.2019 to conclude it expeditiously and at that time also no action was taken with regard to arrest of the present applicant and further, he was taken into custody on 19.08.2026; further taking into consideration that there is no allegation to the effect that the present applicant received any financial gain after issuance of 10 cheques to various firms; investigation is complete and the applicant is in jail since 19.08.2026 and further conclusion of trial may take some considerable time, without making any observation on merits of the matter, I am inclined to grant bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the instant bail

application is **allowed.**

7. It is directed that the applicant shall be released on bail on his furnishing a **personal bond** in sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the Court concerned with 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.

8. The observation made herein above is for the purpose of deciding this bail application only and the trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Anjani