NIRMALA
RAO

CGHC010347162026 2026:CGHC:43430

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8409 of 2026

1 - Vivek Sharma S/o Ramesh Sharma Aged About 39 Years R/o Sadak No. 5, House No. 374, Shanti Nagar, Police Station Vaishali Nagar, District Durg Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Of Police Station Sarangarh, District Sarangarh-Bilaigarh Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant/s	:	Mr. Jitendra Shukla, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Saini, Dy.G.A.
For Objector	:	Mr. Pawan Kesharwani, Advocate.

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 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) for grant of regular bail to the applicant in connection with the Crime No.90/2026, registered at Police Station Sarangarh, District Sarangarh- Bilaigarh for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 34 of IPC.

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the complainant lodged a complaint before the concerned police station stating that the applicant had taken a sum of Rs.7,40,000/- from him on the assurance of providing him with a government job. It is further alleged that the applicant had taken amounts from several other persons, totalling Rs.20,04,000/-. Thereafter, the offence/FIR was registered against the applicant, and he was arrested in connection with the aforesaid crime.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He further submits that the applicant has been in jail since 7.4.2026, the charge-sheet has been filed, and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time. Therefore, he prays that the instant bail application may kindly be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that there are five criminal antecedents against the present applicant, out of which four are of a similar nature. He would further submit that the applicant took a sum of Rs.7,40,000/- from the complainant on the assurance that he would provide him with a government job. He would also submit that the application filed by the applicant deserves to be dismissed.

5. Heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.

6. Having considered the fact that the applicant has five criminal antecedents, out of which four are of a similar nature, and that, in the present case, it is alleged that the applicant took a sum of Rs.7,40,000/- from the complainant on the assurance that he would

provide him with a government job, and that the said amount was transferred to the bank account of the present applicant through RTGS and PhonePe, there is sufficient material in the case diary to prima facie establish the said fact.

7. Having considered the criminal antecedents of the present applicant and the manner in which the offence was committed, I am not inclined to allow the bail application filed by the present applicant.

8. Accordingly, the first bail application filed by the applicant is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
Rakesh Mohan Pandey
JUDGE

Nimmi