CGHC010394732026 2026:CGHC:46699

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9502 of 2026

- Mohammad Kamal Son Of Mohammad Akram, Aged About 25 Years Resident Of Paanch Rasta, Supela, Bhilai, Tehsil And District Durg, Chhattisgarh. (Wrongly Mentioned As Mohammad Kalam In The Impugned Order)

--- **Applicant**

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Bhilai Nagar, District Durg Chhattisgarh.

--- **Non-applicant**

WITH

MCRC No. 9625 of 2026

- Geeta Lanjewar W/o Rajkumar Lanjewar Aged About 60 Years (Wrongly Mentioned As S/o Instead Of W/o In Main Cause Title), (Age Wrongly Mentioned In Covering Memo Of Impugned Order) R/o 133, Sangam Chowk, Punjabi Mohalla, Near Bhanjan Pandas Residence, New Khursipar, Bhilai, District Durg Chhattisgarh (Bhilai Wrongly Not Mentioned In Covering Memo Of Impugned Order) (Near Bhanjan Pandas Residence Wrongly Not Mentioned In Main Cause-Title Of Impugned Order)

---**Applicant**

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, P.S. Bhilai Nagar, District Durg Chhattisgarh (Wrongly Mentioned As Police Station Sector 6, Bhilai Nagar, In Main Cause Title Of Impugned Order)

--- **Non-applicant**

For Applicants	:	Mr. Anshuman Shrivastava, Advocate **(in MCRC/9502/2026)** Ms. Aditi Singhvi, Advocate **(in MCRC/9625/2026)**
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Saini, Dy.G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

04.11.2026

1. These are the first bail applications filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicants who have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 388/2026 registered at Police Station Bhilai Nagar, District Durg (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 318(3), 318(4) and 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that Police Station Bhilai Nagar received information from the Ministry of Home Affairs, Govt. of India, regarding various bank accounts being used in cyber fraud which fall under the category of layer-1/mule accounts. The accounts of the present applicants were also mentioned in the list provided by the competent authority. Thereafter, the police registered an offence and arrested the applicants on 28.07.2026.

3. Learned counsel for the respective applicants jointly submit that though the bank accounts of the applicants were used for a fraud

of Rs. 37,900/- and Rs. 63,850/-, they had no knowledge that their bank accounts were being used by the fraudsters, and the applicants are ready to deposit the said amount. They further submit that the charge-sheet has already been filed, the applicants have been in judicial custody since 28.07.2026, and the trial is likely to take considerable time; therefore, they pray for the grant of regular bail to the applicants.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail applications and submits that the applicants had provided their bank accounts to the fraudsters on a commission of Rs. 4,200/- and thus, they were actively involved in the cyber fraud; therefore, the applicants are not entitled to be enlarged on bail.

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

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the allegations levelled against the applicants, and the fact that applicants have no criminal antecedents; further considering that the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent court, the applicants have been in judicial custody since 28.07.2026, and conclusion of the trial is likely to take time, this Court is of the view that the applicants are entitled to be released on bail.

7. It is directed that in the event of the applicants executing a

personal bond for a sum of **Rs. 50,000/-** to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, they shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

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

(b) they 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) they 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 these bail applications only, the learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

A j i n k y a