CGHC010387042026 2026:CGHC:43287

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SUMIT KUMAR Digitally signed by SUMIT KUMAR Date: 2026.10.07 11:58:32 +0530

MCRC No. 9352 of 2026

Manoj Kumar Shrivastava S/o Amresh Kumar Shrivastava Aged About 52 Years R/o Kumhar Para Dongargarh, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Police Station Rakhi, District Raipur C.G.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Siddharth Pandey, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Rishi Raj Pithwa, Dy.G.A. alongwith Ms. Richa Sahu, P.L. for the State

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, J.)

Order on Board

06/10/2026

1. Present is a second bail application of the applicant. The first bail application of the applicant has been dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh at an appropriate stage vide order dated 24.07.2026 passed by this Court in MCRC No. 6689/2026.

2. The applicant, who has been arrested on 04.05.2026 in connection with Crime No. 76/2026 registered at Police Station – Rakhi, District – Raipur for the offence under Section 318(4), 319(2), 336(2), 336(3) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and 66D of the Information

Technology Act, 2000.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 23.04.2026, the complainant, Rajpal Baghel, Section Officer, General Administration Department, Police Station Rakhi, District Raipur, lodged a complaint regarding circulation of a forged appointment order purporting to recommend appointments to various posts in different departments. The forged order allegedly bore the digital signatures of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary, General Administration Department, and was purportedly issued pursuant to an order dated 12.03.2026. During investigation, the police recorded statements of the complainant and witnesses, prepared the site map, and allegedly traced the creation of the forged appointment order to the present applicant, Manoj Kumar Shrivastava. It was alleged that the applicant prepared the forged documents using his computer, while co-accused Rajesh Sharma circulated them through WhatsApp with the intention of inducing people to believe that the appointments were genuine. Pursuant to the memorandum of co-accused Rajesh Sharma, a computer CPU, printer, keyboard and mouse were allegedly seized from the possession of the applicant. Forensic examination of the seized computer purportedly revealed material relating to the forged appointment order. Consequently, FIR bearing Crime No. 76/2026 was registered against the applicant and co-accused Rajesh Sharma for offences under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(2), 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 and Section 66D of the Information Technology Act. After completion of investigation, the police filed the charge-sheet dated 01.07.2026, and charges for the aforesaid offences were framed against the applicant and co-accused on 05.08.2026.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant has been charged with preparing forged appointment letters purportedly for the appointment of various persons in the General Administration Department, Government of Chhattisgarh, and it is alleged that the said forged appointment letters were prepared from the computer device seized from the applicant. He would further submit that although the computer device of the applicant has been seized, there is no allegation that the applicant circulated the said forged appointment letters to any person or to any of the alleged victims. It is submitted that, in the present case, there is no complainant who has alleged that he was cheated by the applicant. He would further submit that the applicant is working as a Computer Operator at a private school at Dongargarh and has not indulged in any such activities. There is also no allegation that the applicant received or obtained any monetary benefit from any person in connection with the alleged offence. He would also submit that the applicant is in jail since 04.05.2026, out of the total 23 prosecution witnesses, 5 witnesses have already been examined, the trial of the case will take its own time and there is no criminal antecedents against the applicant, therefore, he may be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the applicant and have submitted that the present applicant and other co-accused persons shared a common intention to cheat various persons, they prepared the forged appointment letters and circulate it through the mobile phones of various persons. The computer device of the present applicant has

been seized from which the relevant data has been recovered which is available in the case diary. Involvement of the present applicant is *prima facie* appears from his computer device and even though there is no any complainant in the present case, the act of the applicant clearly demonstrates his involvement in the offence of preparing the forged documents and cheating. The first bail application of the applicant has been dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh at an appropriate stage, out of total 23 witnesses, 05 witnesses have already been examined and the trial is in progress, therefore, the applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

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

7. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the nature and gravity of allegation, material collected during the investigation, further considering the role of the applicant as alleged by the prosecution, the material available in the case diary, the seizure of the computer device from the present applicant in which certain relevant materials have been extracted by the police and also that out of total 23 witnesses, 05 witnesses have already been examined and the trial is in progress, I am not inclined to admit this second bail application of the present applicant.

8. Accordingly, the second bail application of the present applicant **Manoj Kumar Shrivastava** is rejected.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
JUDGE

Sumit