CGHC010373152026 2026:CGHC:45399

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9092 of 2026

Bhartendu Meshram S/o Shri Dilip Kumar Meshram Aged About 36 Years R/o Ekta Nagar, Thaklabod, District North Bastar Kanker, Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Bhilai Bhatti, District Durg Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Virendra Kashyap, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Kawaljeet Singh Saini, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

27.10.2026

1. This is the First bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 100/2026 registered at Police Station : Bhilai Bhatti, District : Durg (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467,

468, 471 and 34 of IPC.

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the complainant, Dinesh Kumar, was allegedly approached and induced in connection with securing a government job for his son, Vishal Kumar. It is alleged that the present applicant, Bhartendu Meshram, along with the co-accused persons, represented that they had contacts with persons capable of securing government employment and, on the basis of such assurance, obtained a sum of approximately Rs. 8,00,000/- from the complainant. It is further alleged that the applicant and the other accused persons provided documents purportedly evidencing the selection/appointment of the complainant's son to a government post, thereby inducing the complainant to part with the aforesaid amount. The said documents were subsequently found to be forged, and no such appointment or selection had been made by the concerned government department. The prosecution further alleges that, in connection with the aforesaid transaction, a cheque for Rs. 8,00,000/- was issued, which was dishonoured upon presentation due to insufficiency of funds. Thereafter, the complainant issued a legal notice and also instituted proceedings under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act in respect of the said cheque. It is alleged that, despite demand, the amount was not fully refunded. Consequently, the complainant approached the police, resulting in the registration of Crime No. 100/2026 at Police Station Bhilai Bhatti, District Durg, for the offences punishable under Sections

420, 467, 468 and 471 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC). The applicant was arrested on 11.08.2026, and his bail application before the learned Magistrate was rejected. Thereafter, his regular bail application, bearing BA No. 1411/2026, was also rejected by the learned Second Additional District and Sessions Judge, Durg, vide order dated 11.09.2026.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that there were two separate transactions. Firstly, a sum of Rs. 8,00,000/- was paid by the complainant, Dinesh Kumar, to Rajesh Sharma in connection with securing a government job, whereas a separate loan of Rs. 8,00,000/- was advanced to the present applicant. He would further submit that the applicant issued a cheque to the complainant in discharge of his liability and, upon dishonour of the said cheque, a complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act was filed before the competent court. He would also submit that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 11.08.2026, has already refunded a sum of Rs. 2,90,000/-, and has no criminal antecedents. Therefore, learned counsel prays that the applicant be released on regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the applicant, along with the co-accused persons, obtained a sum of Rs. 8,00,000/- from the complainant on the assurance of securing a government job. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

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

diary.

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 11.08.2026, has no criminal antecedents, and has already refunded a sum of Rs. 2,90,000/-, I am of the opinion that the applicant is entitled to be released on regular bail in the present case.

7. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond for a sum of **Rs. 50,000/-** to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

(a) he shall make himself available for interrogation by the police officer as and when required;

(b)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; and

(c) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to a fair and expeditious trial.

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

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Saurabh