CGHC010368582026 2026:CGHC:43731

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8972 of 2026

Girja Kashyap W/o Kishan Kumar Aged About 24 Years R/o Pendri Police Station Janjgir District Janjgir Champa C.G. **... Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer Police Station Janjgir District Janjgir Champa C.G. **... Non-Applicant**

For Applicant	**:**	Mr. Sushil Dubey, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	**:**	Ms. Priya Sharma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

08/10/2026

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. 627/2026 registered at Police Station Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.) for offences punishable under Sections 306, 336(2), 338, and 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. The applicant is in custody since 25.08.2026.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the complainant, Ms. Sunita Sahu, lodged a report alleging that the applicant worked at her residence from June 2025 to 31.05.2026. It is alleged that during the said period, the applicant stole a cheque leaf from the complainant's

residence, filled in an amount of ₹85,000/- drawn to "self", forged the complainant's signature, and presented it before the State Bank of India, Janjgir Branch on 24.08.2026 to fraudulently withdraw the said amount. On verification by the bank authorities, the alleged forgery was detected, pursuant to which the present crime came to be registered.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the complainant herself handed over the cheque to the applicant for encashment, and no fraudulent act was committed by her. It is further submitted that the alleged cheque was never encashed and no wrongful loss was actually caused to the complainant. Learned counsel emphasizes that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedents, she has been languishing in jail since 25.08.2026 along with her 2.5 year old daughter, and conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time; thus, she may be enlarged on regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submitted that the applicant, while working in the house of complainant, she committed theft of a cheque from her house, forged her signature, and attempted to encash an amount of ₹85,000/- from the bank, and looking to the nature of the allegations, she may not be enlarged on bail.

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

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, and the fact that the cheque in question was not encashed and no actual monetary loss was caused to the complainant; further considering that the applicant is a woman, having no criminal antecedents, she is in custody since 25.08.2026 accompanied by her 2.5 year old child, and the conclusion of the trial is

likely to take some time, this Court, without commenting upon the merits of the case, is inclined to release the applicant on bail. Accordingly, the application is **allowed**.

7. 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, she shall be released on bail, on following conditions :-

(i) she 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) she shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, and

(iii) she shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to her by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

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

Sd/-

Rakesh Mohan Pandey

JUDGE

Nadim