CGHC010383642026 2026:CGHC:44381

NAFR

KUNAL DEWANGAN

Digitally signed by KUNAL DEWANGAN

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9822 of 2026

Trilok Patel S/o Late Vijay Patel Aged About 23 Years R/o Ward No. 12, Dwarika Gali, Fuljhariya Para Sarangarh, P.S. City Kotwali Sarangarh, Distt. Sarangarh Bilaigarh, Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Of Police Station Sarangarh, Distt. Sarangarh Bilaigarh, Chhattisgarh.

... Non-Applicant(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Shikhar Sharma, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/State	:	Mr. K.S. Saini, Dy. Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

14/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this second bail application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 222/2025 registered at Police Station Sarangarh, District Sarangarh-Bilaigarh (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 111 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Earlier, the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on

merits by a coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC No. 1941/2026 vide order dated 25.03.2026. Hence, this second bail application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the first bail application was rejected on merits, however, the present application is being pressed on the ground that out of 10 prosecution witnesses, only 4 have been examined and the witnesses examined so far have not stated anything incriminating against the applicant. He would further submit that the evidence collected by the prosecution does not disclose sufficient prima facie material to establish the applicant's involvement in the alleged offences and that the applicant had no knowledge as to how or by whom his bank account was misused, the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and he is in jail since 15.05.2025 and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time therefore, learned counsel prays for grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant of bail and submit that the first bail application of the applicant has already been rejected on merits. It is further submitted that the bank account standing in the name of the applicant was linked to 13 cyber fraud complaints registered from different States through the National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal (1930), and an amount of Rs. 7,76,915/- was reported in connection with the said complaints, apart from the substantial transactions reflected in the investigation. The material collected during investigation prima facie indicates the involvement of the applicant in facilitating the receipt

and transfer of money obtained through cyber fraud. Therefore, in view of the nature and gravity of the allegations and the material available on record, the applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

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

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the allegations, the material collected during investigation, it appears that the bank account standing in the name of applicant was linked to 13 cyber fraud complaints registered from different States and was allegedly used for routing money obtained through cyber fraud. The contention that the witnesses examined so far have not stated anything incriminating against the applicant cannot, at this stage, be treated as conclusive of his innocence, as the reliability and credibility of the evidence are matters to be assessed during trial. At this stage, this Court is not required to conduct a mini-trial or undertake a detailed appreciation of the evidence. Further, the first bail application of the applicant has already been rejected on merits and the progress of the trial, as pointed out by learned counsel for the applicant, does not constitute sufficient ground in the facts of the present case to take a different view. Considering the specific role attributed to the applicant and the material indicating the alleged use of his bank account in multiple cyber fraud complaints, I do not find any good ground to enlarge the applicant on bail.

7. Accordingly, the second bail application of the applicant, filed under Section 483 of BNSS, Involved in Crime No. 222/2025 registered at Police Station Sarangarh, District Sarangarh-Bilaigarh (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 111 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, is **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Kunal