VED
PRAKASH
DEWANGAN

Digitally signed
by VED PRAKASH
DEWANGAN
Date: 2026.10.08
10:58:38 +0530

CGHC010373982026 2026:CGHC:43326

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9025 of 2026

Neeraj Ranglani @ Golu S/o Purushottam Ranglani, Aged About 34 Years R/o Near Dream Plaza, Amlidih, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.) Thana - New Rajendra Nagar, Raipur (C.G.)

--- **Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station In - Charge, Police Station -Civil Lines, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent

(Cause title taken from Case Information System)

For Applicant	:	Dr. Sudeep Agrawal, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Rajkumar Sahu, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal

Order on Board

06/10/2026

1. This is the first bail application of the applicant, Neeraj Ranglani @ Golu under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred as “BNSS”), who has been arrested on 25.08.2026 in connection with Crime No. 71 of 2026, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Raipur, District Raipur, for the offence punishable under Sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Chhattisgarh Gambling

(Prohibition) Act, 2022 and Section 112(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 05.02.2026, while patrolling, on a secrete information being received by the police that a person is engaged in playing online gambling through his mobile phone near Surya Apartment, Katora Talab, Raipur, the police conducted raid and found Arun Kumar Yadav (co-accused). He disclosed to the police that he along with Manish Asrani and Golu @ Neeraj Ranglani (present applicant) are running the Ganpati Book Online Platform and made available the ID in the name of betonly777.com and allpenal777.now to the persons for online gambling. From his possession one mobile phone and cash of Rs. 2,500/- have been seized and FIR has been registered. Since the present applicant was absconding, the charge sheet was filed against co-accused persons Arun Kumar Yadav and Manish Asrani showing the present applicant Neeraj Ranglani @ Golu as absconding. The present applicant approached this Court for grant of anticipatory bail in MCRCA No. 529 of 2026, which was dismissed by this court on 23.04.2026. The applicant again filed his anticipatory bail application bearing MCRCA No. 831 of 2026, which was again dismissed on 29.06.2026. Thereafter he approached Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Crl) No. 14791 of 2026, which was disposed of on 14.08.2026 with the observation that the petitioner through learned counsel appearing for him, undertakes to surrender on or before 25.08.2026. It has also been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that, it shall be opened for the applicant to move an

application seeking regular bail. As and when such an application is filed, the same shall be considered and decided in accordance with law. Thereafter, the applicant has surrendered before the learned trial Court on 25.08.2026 and then claiming regular bail in the case.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that, there is no evidence against the applicant that he engaged in online gambling with other co-accused persons. Neither any electronic evidence nor any direct evidence or any incriminating material seized against the present applicant, which connects him with the offence in question. Even through the mobile phone of the co-accused Arun Kumar Yadav, his involvement is not there with the offence in question. The applicant is not connected with the other co-accused persons. Except for the memorandum statement of the co-accused Arun Kumar Yadav or Manish Asrani, there is no other incriminating material against the applicant to implicate him in the offence in question. Even, there is no bank transaction details or any electronic evidence extracted from the mobile phone of the co-accused. Though certain criminal antecedents have been found against the applicant, however one offence is under Section 420 of IPC, in which the applicant is on bail and the another offence under Section 4-A of Gambling Prohibition Act, 1867 was of the year 2016, in which the applicant has been acquitted. There is no other criminal antecedent against the applicant. After his surrender before the learned trial Court, charge has been framed against him on 22.09.2026 and the trial against the present applicant has not been commenced, though with respect to the other accused persons trial

commenced and 10 witnesses have been examined. He would further submit that the wife of the applicant is carrying 16 weeks pregnancy and having certain complications in her pregnancy for which treatment is continued at Anshuman Nursing Home, Raipur. He referred her medical treatment documents (Annexure A/5) and would submit that, there is no other male member in the family and she needs proper care during her pregnancy as she already suffered miscarriage of her earlier pregnancy. The offence is triable by Judicial Magistrate First Class and will take its own time for conclusion, therefore, the applicant may be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the applicant and submitted that, in the memorandum statement of co-accused Arun Kumar Yadav, the name of the present applicant appears that he is engaged in playing online gambling through the betting app of betonly777.com and allpenal777.now and they are running Ganpati Book Online Betting Platform. He would also submit that from the memorandum statement of one Arun Kumar Yadav, who is also a co-accused in the present case, the involvement of the present applicant is also there that the accused persons including the present applicant prepared a syndicate and engaged in playing online gambling. The statement of the witnesses Safir Ahmad and Pankaj Chelak, in whose presence the accused Arun Kumar Yadav disclosed about the involvement of the accused persons. From the mobile phone of Arun Yadav the relevant data was extracted, which pointed toward involvement of

the applicant in the offence. He would further submit that though from the medical report of the wife of the applicant disclosed that she is carrying pregnancy of about 16 weeks, however there is no such complications noticed by the doctor. The wife of the applicant is presently residing with her parents and required treatment is continued. He would also submit that the first regular bail application of the co-accused Manish Asrani has been dismissed by this Court in MCRC No. 2771 of 2026 and second regular bail application has been dismissed in MCRC No. 4091 of 2026, therefore, the present applicant is not entitled for bail.

5. With respect to the medical treatment documents (Annexure A/5) of the wife of the applicant, on 25.09.2026, this Court has directed the State counsel to verify the medical documents submitted by the applicant (Annexure A/5) and in pursuance thereof, learned counsel appearing for the State produced the medical report of the wife of the applicant, which is being taken on record. According to the medical report, the wife of the applicant is carrying pregnancy of about 16 weeks and was advised rest and medication given accordingly.

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

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the case diary, considering the allegations levelled against the applicant, the material collected during investigation, particularly the memorandum statement of co-accused Arun Kumar Yadav and the

data extracted from his mobile phone indicating the involvement of the present applicant in running the online betting platform and participating in the alleged gambling syndicate, and further taking into consideration that the applicant has subsequently surrendered pursuant to the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court does not, by itself, entitle him to bail. So far as the pregnancy and medical condition of the applicant's wife is concerned, the medical report produced by the State indicates that she is carrying pregnancy of about 16 weeks and has been advised rest and medication; however, the said circumstance, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, does not outweigh the nature of allegations and the material available against the applicant. The trial has already commenced against the co-accused persons and 10 witnesses have been examined. Therefore, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant does not deserve to be enlarged on bail.

8. Accordingly, the present bail application of the applicant **Neeraj Ranglani @ Golu** is hereby **rejected**.

9. I.A. No. 01 of 2026, which is an application for grant of ad-interim bail, is also disposed of.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

ved