CGHC010304592026 2026:CGHC:44183

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 7370 of 2026

Vikas Rao @ Bhaiyu S/o Rajendra Rao Aged About 25 Years R/o Makan No. 74, Ward No. 27, Shree Nagar, P.S. City Kotwali, Distt. Dewas, M.P.

--- **Applicant(s)**

KUNAL DEWANGAN

Digitally signed by KUNAL DEWANGAN

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, P.S. Bacheli, Dantewada, Chhattisgarh.

--- **Non-applicant(s)**

For Applicant	**:**	Mr. Syed Ishhadil Ali, Advocate.
For Non-applicants/State	**:**	Mr. Keshav Gupta, Govt. Advocate.

MCRC No. 9109 of 2026

Bhupendra Jangid S/o Bhagirath Jangid Aged About 23 Years R/o Balaji Nagar Sangri Bypass Thana Audyogik Kshetra Basni Distt. Jodhpur (Rajasthan)

---**Applicant(s)**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. - Bacheli Distt. South Bastar Dantewada C.G.

...**Non-Applicant(s)**

For Applicant	**:**	Mr. Vikas A. Shrivastava, Advocate.
For Non-applicants/State	**:**	Mr. Keshav Gupta, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri. Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

13/10/2026

1. Since the above two bail applications are arising out of same crime number, same police station and same offences so they are being heard and decided by this common order.

2. The applicants have preferred these First Bail Applications under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of regular bail, as they have been arrested in connection with Crime No.38/2024, registered at Police Station Bacheli, District: South Bastar Dantewada (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 420 of IPC and Section 66(D) of I.T. Act.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 13.07.2024, the complainant lodged a written report at Police Station Bacheli alleging that, between 01.06.2024 and 23.06.2024, he received messages containing Telegram links from unknown mobile numbers and was induced to invest money through a purported online investment platform associated with CoinDCX. Believing the representations regarding investment returns and profits, the complainant transferred various amounts through Google Pay and online banking to different bank accounts on several dates. However, when he attempted to withdraw the displayed profit amount, he was unable to do so and was asked to invest further amounts. The complainant alleged that he had thereby been cheated of a total amount of Rs. 20,91,700/-. On the basis of the report, the aforesaid offence was registered against the unknown mobile numbers. During the course of investigation, banking and

technical evidence was collected and it was found that an amount of ₹2,80,000/- transferred by the complainant had reached an HDFC Bank account standing in the name of co-accused Lakhan Singh Jhala. The applicants along with co-accused were subsequently implicated in the case and arrested during investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants would submit that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. They would further submit that the applicants are not the ultimate beneficiaries of the amount allegedly transferred by the complainant and that the money was transferred to various bank accounts belonging to other persons. It is also submitted that the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court and therefore, no further custodial interrogation of the applicants is required. The applicants are in jail since 17.05.2026 and 02.04.2026, respectively and have no criminal antecedents. They would further submit that the trial is likely to take considerable time for its conclusion and therefore, the applicants may be enlarged on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant of bail and submit that the complainant was induced to invest money through Telegram links and a purported online investment platform on the false promise of earning substantial profits, resulting in an alleged financial loss of Rs. 20,91,700/-. He would further submit that the applicants have been implicated on the basis of the banking and technical evidence collected during

investigation. It is also submitted that an amount of ₹1,00,000/- was seized from the bank account of co-accused Sunil Joshi. Accordingly, he prays for rejection of the bail application.

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

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the allegations, material collected during investigation, the fact that the alleged amount was transferred to various bank accounts and the amount of Rs.1,00,000/- was seized from the bank account of co-accused Sunil Joshi and not from the present applicants, coupled with the fact that the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court and applicants have no criminal antecedents and they have been in custody since 17.05.2026 and 02.04.2026, respectively, thus, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am inclined to allow the bail applications.

8. Accordingly, the bail applications of the applicants are **allowed**. It is directed that in the event of the applicants executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety each in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, they shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

(i) they 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 them from disclosing such fact to the Court;
(ii) they shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, &
(iii) they shall appear before the trial Court on each

and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Kunal