CGHC010360462026 2026:CGHC:43044

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8599 of 2026

Tanisha Baghel D/o Rupesh Kumar Baghel Aged About 23 Years R/o- Village Dewarmaal, P.S.- Urga, District- Korba (C.G.)

... Applicant(s)

versus

KUNAL DEWANGAN

Digitally signed by KUNAL DEWANGAN

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer Police Station- Mahasamund District- Mahasamund (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Sanjay Agrawal, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/State	:	Mr. Saurabh K. Pandey, Dy. Adv. General.

Hon'ble Mr. Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

05/10/2026

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 585/2024 registered at Police Station Mahasamund, District Mahasamund (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 6 and 10 of the Chhattisgarh Protection of Depositors Interest Act, 2005.

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 04.02.2024, co-accused Akhilesh Singh opened an office of Flora Max Company at Preetam Pride Complex, Swami Chowk, Mahasamund, wherein the accused persons, including the present applicant, were allegedly working in different capacities. It is alleged that the accused persons induced women by assuring them of making them self-reliant and promised to provide them financial assistance for purchase of sarees, ration and for starting small businesses, besides arranging bank loans and paying a monthly amount of Rs.2,700/-. It is further alleged that an amount of Rs.30,000/- was collected from each woman and the said amount was deposited in the account of co-accused Mudiya Singh thereafter, the accused persons committed cheating and misappropriation of the amount so collected. During investigation, the statements of the concerned women were recorded and the offence under Sections 6 and 10 of the Chhattisgarh Protection of Depositors' Interests Act was also added. The present applicant has been implicated in the case on the allegation that she was working as a Peon in the office of the said company and was associated with the activities of the other accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He would further submit that the applicant was merely working as a peon in the company and had no role in the alleged transactions or in collection/misappropriation of the deposited amount. He would further submit that several co-accused persons involved in the same crime have already been enlarged on bail, including four co-

accused persons by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and five co-accused persons by the learned trial Court and the applicant is in custody since 04.08.2026 and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time therefore, he prays for grant of bail on the ground of parity.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant of bail and submit that the applicant was working in the concerned company and has been implicated in connection with the alleged fraudulent collection of money from the investors. It is alleged that the investors were induced to deposit money on the assurance of business and monthly returns and the amount was thereafter misappropriated pursuant to the alleged conspiracy. However, learned State counsel could not dispute the fact that several co-accused persons in the same crime have already been granted bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary as well as the material available on record.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegations, the role attributed to the present applicant, who is alleged to have been working merely as a peon in the concerned company and further considering the fact that several co-accused persons involved in the same Crime No. 585/2024 have already been enlarged on bail, including four co-accused persons by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and five co-accused persons by the learned trial Court and also considering the period of custody of the

applicant since 04.08.2026 and the fact that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, thus without further commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant deserves to be released on regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant is **allowed**. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail on 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.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Kunal