CGHC010398332026 2026:CGHC:47186

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9569 of 2026

Deepak Verma S/o - S. L. Verma, Aged About 45 Years R/o - New Anshik Gudambakursi Road, Lucknow, Near Arjun Enclave, Permanent R/o - Bhujayee Gaon, Near Ranjha Airport, Banke, District Bheri (Nepal) (Wrongly Portrayed As The Resident Of Nepal, Not A Nepali Citizen / Resident)

--- **Applicant**

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station C B I, A C B, Raipur, District Raipur C.G.

2 - Central Bureau Of Investigation Through The Superintendent Of Police, C.B.I., A.C.B. (Anti Corruption Bureau), District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

--- **Respondent(s)**

MCRC No. 9727 of 2026

Anmol Ukey S/o Mahendra Ukey Aged About 34 Years R/o. Shivanath Vihar, Phase - 2, Quarter No. 509, W.R.S. Colony, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

--- **Applicant (s)**

Versus

Central Bureau Of Investigation, Through The Superintendent Of Police, C.B.I., Anti-Corruption Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

--- **Respondent(s)**

For Respective Applicants	:	Ms. Fouzia Mirza, Senior Advocate with Mr. Ali Afzaal Mirza and Mr. Manoj Paranjpe, Senior Advocate with Mr. Rishabh Gupta, Advocate

For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Vaibhav A. Goverdhan, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

16.11.2026

1. This is the first bail application filed under under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. RC1242026A0006/2026 registered at Police Station: CBI, ACB, Raipur, District: Raipur, Chhattisgarh for the offence punishable under Sections 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and Section 61 (2) of BNS.

2. As per the prosecution case, a written complaint dated 11.08.2026 was lodged by Shri Ankit Sharma, Proprietor of M/s Hitesh Udyog, alleging that the Applicant had demanded a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- for clearing the bills submitted against Purchase Order No. 96255002100303 dated 07.05.2025, pertaining to the supply and commissioning of four Lock Bolting Machines. It is further alleged that the bribe amount was subsequently reduced to Rs. 1,00,000/-. As per the allegations in the FIR, during a conversation between the Applicant- Anmol Ukey and the complainant on 12.08.2026, the Applicant- Anmol Ukey informed the complainant that he had already signed the bills. Thereafter, on 13.08.2026, a trap was laid by the CBI. It is alleged that the Applicant- Anmol Ukey instructed the complainant to hand over a sum of Rs. 50,000/- to the co-accused, Deepak Kumar Verma. The said amount was allegedly recovered from the person/pocket of the aforesaid co-accused. Significantly, no tainted currency was recovered from the person or possession of the present Applicant- Anmol Ukey.

3. Learned Senior Advocates appearing for the respective applicants would submit that applicant Anmol Ukey never accepted any gratification from the complainant. The alleged amount was handed over to Deepak Verma, who is not a public servant but was working as a Sales Manager with M/s Emprise Marketing, Lucknow. It is further submitted that the charge-sheet has already been filed, the applicants have been in custody since 13.08.2026 and 14.08.2026, respectively. It is also contended that applicant- Deepak Verma has no criminal antecedents.

4. Mr. Manoj Paranjpe, learned Senior Advocate, would further submit that, during the course of investigation, a separate FIR was registered against applicant Anmol Ukey for the alleged commission of an offence punishable under Section 13(1)(b) of the Prevention of Corruption Act. On the aforesaid grounds, learned counsel pray for grant of bail to the applicants.

5. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the non-applicant/CBI, Mr. Vaibhav A. Goverdhan, Advocate, would submit that an order for the supply of four Lock Bolting Machines was placed by SECR and the said machines were supplied by the complainant, Ankit Sharma. He would further submit that when the complainant raised his bills, no heed was paid by the authorized officer, namely, applicant Anmol Ukey, Senior Mechanical Engineer, SECR. It is contended that the complainant thereafter approached applicant Anmol Ukey personally, who allegedly demanded a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/-. Learned counsel would further submit that the conversation between the applicants and the complainant was recorded. Subsequently, a trap was laid, during which an amount of Rs. 50,000/- was recovered from

the co-accused, Deepak Verma. It is, therefore, contended that there was a clear demand by applicant Anmol Ukey and that, at his instance, the amount was handed over to the co-accused, Deepak Verma. Thus, a prima facie case is made out against the applicants, warranting rejection of the bail applications.

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

7. In the present case, the charge-sheet has already been filed. The applicants have been in custody since 13.08.2026 and 14.08.2026, respectively, and they have no criminal antecedents. Applicant Deepak Verma is not a public servant; rather, he was working as a Sales Manager in a private company. Applicant Anmol Ukey has already been placed under suspension. Though an allegation of demand has been made against applicant Anmol Ukey, no gratification was recovered from his possession or person. For establishing an offence under the Prevention of Corruption Act, the prosecution is required to establish the essential ingredients of demand and acceptance of illegal gratification. So far as the criminal antecedents of applicant Anmol Ukey are concerned, it appears that a separate FIR was registered against him during the course of investigation. Having regard to the facts and circumstances discussed hereinabove, particularly the filing of the charge-sheet, the period of incarceration undergone by the applicants, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am inclined to allow the bail applications.

8. It is directed that, upon each of the applicants furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court, the applicants shall be released on bail, subject to the following

conditions:

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

(b)he 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) he 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 this bail application only, the learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Saurabh