CGHC010360882026 2026:CGHC:43043

NAFR

KUNAL DEWANGAN

Digitally signed by KUNAL DEWANGAN

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8851 of 2026

Tanisha Baghel D/o Rupesh Kumar Baghel Aged About 23 Years R/o Village Dewarmaal Police Station Urga, District Korba Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through - Station House Officer Police Station Champa, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh.

... 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. 517/2024 registered at Police Station Champa, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 318(4), 111(1)(II) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 6 and 10 of the Chhattisgarh Protection of Depositors Interest Act, 2005.

2. Prosecution case, in brief, is that the Director, Manager and other functionaries of A-Flora Max Service Private Limited, in furtherance of a planned scheme, induced about 2,700 persons of Champa and surrounding villages to deposit an amount of Rs.30,000/- each by promising a monthly return of Rs.2,700/- and commission. It is alleged that, pursuant to such inducement, an amount of approximately Rs.8.10 Crores was collected from the investors, whereafter the company closed its office and its functionaries absconded. On the basis of the complaint lodged by the complainant, Crime No.517/2024 was registered at Police Station Champa. The present applicant has been implicated as one of the accused persons, with the allegation that she, along with the co-accused persons, participated in the said scheme and induced the persons to deposit money.

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 11 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. 517/2024 have already been enlarged on bail, including 4 co-accused persons by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and 11 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