CGHC010381832026 2026:CGHC:45189

NAFR

SYED ROSHAN ZAMIR ALI
Digitally signed by SYED ROSHAN ZAMIR ALI

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1618 of 2026

1. Avinash Kujur S/o Late Shri Pawal Kujur Aged About 31 Years R/o Village Kantiprakashpur, Luchki, Police Station And Tahsil Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Gandhinagar, Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.)

... Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Shikhar Shukla, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Ms. Sunita Manikpuri, Government Advocate

SB: Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Order On Board

26/10/2026

1. This is first bail application filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of anticipatory bail to applicant who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.254/2026 registered at Police Station Gandhi Nagar, Ambikapur District Surguja (CG) under Sections 317 (4) and 318 (4) of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita (BNS).

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on the basis of letter received from the Nodal Officer, Indian Cyber Crime Coordination Portal (14C), Surguja to take action against the mule bank accounts used in Cyber frauds, the police of Police Station- Gandhi Nagar, Ambikapur has conducted an inquiry and during inquiry, it has been revealed that various amounts have been transferred online in bank account No.80280100014686 of Bank of Baroda, Namnakala Branch, Ambikapur linked with Mobile No.7616863875, which are in the name of applicant. Accordingly, instant crime is registered against the applicant and police are in search of applicant.

3. Learned counsel for applicant would submit that applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in crime in question. He submits that the applicant being an employee (Driver) has given his details to his employer for opening of a bank account for the purpose of transferring salary. Applicant is not aware about the misuse of his bank account for the purpose of Cyber crime. There is no other criminal antecedent against the applicant, he is ready to co- operate with the Police in investigation and also to abide by all terms and conditions that may be imposed by this Court while granting anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel opposes submissions of learned counsel for applicant and submits that

there is transaction of Rs.1,35,046/- in the bank account of applicant and therefore, applicant is not entitled for benefit of anticipatory bail.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. On being asked from learned counsel for applicant about the name of employer of applicant and driving license of applicant, he has submits that he has neither disclosed name of employer of applicant in bail application nor annexed copy of driving license of applicant.

7. Taking into consideration the submission of learned counsel for respective parties, nature of allegations and the manner in which offence is alleged to have been committed, I am not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicant. Accordingly, anticipatory bail application of applicant is rejected.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge