CGHC010351202026 2026:CGHC:45305

Digitally signed
by RAMESH
KUMAR VATTI
Date: 2026.10.28
11:01:49 +0530

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8633 of 2026

*** -** Nauleshwar Patle S/o Omkar Patle, Aged About 35 Years At Near Dr. G.K. Verma Clinic, Sanjay Nagar, Supela, District- Durg (C.G.)

... Applicant

Versus

*** -** State Of Chhattisgarh Through S H O P.S. Utai, District- Durg (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Lukesh Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Deputy Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Order on Board

27/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this first bail application under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 as he is in jail since 17.06.2026 in connection with Crime No. 246/2026 registered in Police Station – Utai, District Durg (CG) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 318(3), 318(4) and 3(5) of BNS.

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that an FIR dated 13.05.2026 under Crime No. 246/2026 was registered at Police Station Utai, District Durg, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 318(2), 318(3), 318(4), and 3(5) of the BNS against the accused-applicant and other co-accused persons, pertaining to alleged

fraudulent monetary transactions conducted through alleged mule accounts. The details of the mule accounts were obtained from IDFC Bank, Utai Branch, District Durg, wherein it was found that a total of 30 mule bank accounts had been opened by the accused persons for transactions involving cyber fraud money. Therefore, an offence was registered against those mule bank account holders, and the matter was taken up for investigation. During the course of the investigation, it was found that IDFC Bank Account Number 10197475088 was being operated by the present accused/applicant, Nauleshwar Patle, who is the proprietor of M/s Soumya Enterprise, located in Akash Ganga Complex, Supela, Bhilai, to which mobile number 7746940000 was linked and registered. Thereafter, the applicant was summoned and interrogated, and his memorandum statement was recorded in the presence of witnesses, wherein he stated that he runs a mobile shop in the name of Soumya Enterprise at Supela, Bhilai, and that a bank account exists in the name of his firm at the aforesaid IDFC First Bank. He further stated that his friend, Anuj Gupta, approached him stating that he required a bank account for certain transactions, and the applicant provided Anuj Gupta with the aforesaid bank account number, ATM card, and other relevant information regarding the account. The aforesaid bank account was operated by Anuj Gupta, during which period transactions amounting to approximately Rs. 16-17 lakhs were carried out by Anuj Gupta through the applicant's account, following which the account was frozen by the bank concerned.

3. Upon further investigation, it was revealed that in IDFC Bank Account No. 10197475088 belonging to the applicant, a total fraudulent amount

of Rs. 9,93,942 was transacted through online cyber fraud between 2024 and 2026, as is evident from the online cyber complaints received against the said account. It was also found that a total of 11 online complaints had been lodged by various victims across different States of the country on the National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal/1930 regarding online financial fraud committed against them by the accused persons. According to the investigating agency, the said account formed part of the network of mule accounts used for routing the proceeds of cyber fraud.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated. He would contend that the charge-sheet has already been filed and the applicant has been in jail since 17.06.2026. He would submit that the entire case of the prosecution is based upon whimsical grounds and the applicant has not been a participant in the commission of any crime as alleged in the charge-sheet. It is contended that the applicant is the sole breadwinner of his family and, in his absence, his entire family is bound to suffer; since he has no criminal antecedents, he may be enlarged on bail.

5. On the other hand, the learned Deputy Advocate General appearing for the State/non-applicant would oppose the prayer for bail. He would submit that the present case does not pertain to an isolated transaction but relates to a well-organized cyber fraud racket. He would contend that during the investigation, an Apple iPhone was seized from the possession of the present applicant, which was being used by the applicant for online financial cyber fraud, and if he is granted bail, he will certainly abscond, which will adversely affect the investigation of

the case. It is further submitted that his release would boost his morale, leading him to re-form his gang and repeat serious offences such as online cricket betting, thereby creating resentment in society, especially as he was arrested after considerable efforts by the police authorities concerned. He would submit that the bail application of the applicant deserves to be rejected.

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

7. The material collected during the course of the investigation *prima facie* reveals that the present crime pertains to an online cyber financial fraud in which a large number of bank accounts were allegedly used as mule accounts for receiving money dishonestly obtained from victims residing in different parts of the country. The investigation further reveals that substantial amounts were credited into the aforesaid IDFC First Bank account, which was found standing in the name of the present applicant, and the investigating agency has collected material to connect such transactions with the proceeds of cyber fraud. The investigation is still underway, and the money trail, the role of the beneficiaries, and the larger conspiracy are yet to be completely unearthed.

8. The prosecution is in the process of tracing the flow of funds, identifying the beneficiaries, and collecting further electronic and documentary evidence. At this stage, this Court cannot rule out the possibility that the release of the applicant may adversely affect the ongoing investigation. Therefore, considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the material collected during the investigation, and the individual role attributed to the present applicant, this Court is not

inclined to release him on regular bail. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this first bail application of the applicant is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

vatti