CGHC010398222026 2026:CGHC:45358

NAFR

VAIBHAV SINGH
Digitally signed by VAIBHAV SINGH
Date: 2026.10.28 11:00:50 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1677 of 2026

Bipin Raturi Son Of Dr. Govind Ballabh Raturi, Aged About 49 Years Resident Of House No. 579, Pragati Vihar, Dharampur, Dehradun (Uttarakhand) (Recorded In The F I R As Vipin Ratodi) **... Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Tarbahar, District Bilaspur (C.G.) **...Respondent**

For Applicant	:	Mr. Kishore Bhaduri, Senior Advocate along with Mr. Pankaj Singh, Advocate.
For Respondent-State	:	Mr. Sumit Singh, Dy. A.G.
For Objector	:	Mr. Ashish Tiwari, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge
ORDER ON BOARD

27/10/2026

1. Applicant has preferred this application under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail as he apprehends his arrest in connection with Crime No. 0317/2026 registered at Police Station - Tarbahar, District Bilaspur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4) 317(4), 111(2) & 3(5) of the BNS.

2. The prosecution story, in brief, is that the complainant, who deals in coal and steel through his firm, SJM Minerals, was introduced by the applicant with one Anil Rai, who was represented as a reputed

businessman dealing in the supply of steel billets. Thereafter, the complainant and Anil Rai formed a partnership firm, namely, Blackrock Irontrade LLP. Pursuant to a purchase order issued by Bolster Tradelink Pvt. Ltd., Indore, the complainant supplied 2,437.810 MT of steel billets, valued at Rs. 12,63,72,632/-, to Sanjay Iron, Bhavnagar, and Sun Steel, Mehsana, between 08.06.2026 and 23.06.2026. Out of the aforesaid amount, the complainant received Rs. 7,36,18,158/-, leaving a balance of Rs. 5,27,54,474/- unpaid. Thereafter, Anil Rai allegedly stopped responding to the complainant's calls. Referring to criminal cases registered against Anil Rai and Praveen Rai in other States, the complainant suspected that the applicant, Anil Rai, Praveen Rai, Sunil Rai and others had cheated him in a planned manner. The delay in lodging the FIR was attributed to the assurance given regarding the return of the outstanding amount.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present crime. He further submits that the only allegation against the applicant is that he introduced the complainant to the co-accused, namely, Anil Rai, Praveen Rai and Sunil Rai, who were associated with the company operating in the name and style of Bolster Tradelink Pvt. Ltd. He contends that, after introducing the parties, the applicant had no further role in the alleged transaction. The complainant supplied goods to Bolster Tradelink Pvt. Ltd. against a purchase order and received a substantial amount towards the value of the goods supplied. It is, therefore, contended that the dispute arises out of a business transaction involving an outstanding amount does not constitute a criminal act on the part of the applicant. He further submits that the applicant has no criminal antecedents and, therefore, prays that he be granted the benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State Counsel opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the applicant and submits that, as per allegations, applicant introduced the complainant to the persons associated with Bolster Tradelink Pvt. Ltd. and also arranged a meeting at Bilaspur, which the applicant attended. He further submits that, pursuant to the agreement between the complainant and the co-accused persons, the complainant supplied steel billets worth approximately Rs. 12 crore, out of which the co-accused persons paid approximately Rs. 7 crore. He contends that, when the remaining amount was not paid, complainant requested the applicant to intervene and mediate between the parties; however, the applicant took no steps in this regard.

5. Learned counsel for the objector also makes submissions similar to those made by learned State Counsel.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties.

7. From the facts and allegations, as submitted by learned State Counsel and learned counsel for the complainant, it appears that, pursuant to the meeting arranged by the applicant, the complainant supplied goods worth approximately Rs.12 crore to the co-accused persons, out of which approximately Rs.7 crore has been paid, while the remaining amount has not been paid.

8. On due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the allegations, submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, nature of the transactions between the complainant and the co-accused persons, and the role attributed to the applicant in the complaint, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, I am inclined to allow this anticipatory bail application.

9. Accordingly, application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of arrest of applicant in connection with the crime in question (0317/2026),

he shall be released on anticipatory bail by the Officer arresting him on his executing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned arresting Officer. Applicant shall also abide by the following conditions:

(i) that the applicant shall make himself available for interrogation before the Investigation Officer as and when required;
(ii) that the applicant 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
(iii) that the applicant shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial;
(iv) that the applicant shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

10. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-

(**Parth Prateem Sahu**)
JUDGE

vaibhav