CGHC010402362026 2026:CGHC:46828

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

(Order reserved on 04-11-2026)

(Final Order delivered on 05 -11-2026)

(Final Order uploaded on 05-11-2026)

MCRC No. 9662 of 2026

1 - Ramgopal Agrawal S/o Late Vidyasagar Agrawal Aged About 67 Years R/o Anupam Nagar, Behind T.V. Tower Near Vinod Provision Store, Raipur, Distt- Raipur (C.G.) (Applicant Details Wrongly Mentioned In Annexure A/1)

... Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through S.H.O. P.S. E O W. / A C B, Distt- Raipur (C.G.) (Respondent Details Wrongly Mentioned In Annexure A/1)

Respondent

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Arshdeep Singh Khurana, Advocate appeared through video conferencing along with Mr. Harsh Shrivastava and Mr. Sajal K. Gupta, Advocates
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Praveen Das, Addl. Adv. General with Mr. Vivek Verma, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge

CAV Order

1. The present application arises out of FIR No. 04 of 2024 dated 17.01.2024 registered by the Economic Offences Wing/Anti-Corruption Bureau, Chhattisgarh, for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 420,

467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 7 and 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. The prosecution case emanates from a communication received from the Directorate of Enforcement alleging the existence of a purported syndicate engaged in irregularities relating to manufacture and sale of liquor in the State of Chhattisgarh during the period 2019-2023.

2. The prosecution case, as reflected in the FIR, alleges that certain persons were involved in generating illegal proceeds through manipulation of liquor supply mechanisms and that such proceeds were allegedly distributed among various members of the syndicate. However, the FIR itself does not contain any allegation against the Applicant, nor does it disclose any overt act attributable to him. The entire case rests on documentary evidence already seized by the Investigating Agency. There are no ocular witnesses and no recoveries are contemplated from the Applicant.

3. The prosecution further alleges the Applicant's complicity in the offences registered vide FIR No. 04/2024 imputing his role in a broader conspiracy evidenced primarily through documentary records compiled over a long investigation. Despite his non-inclusion in the initial FIR or primary charge-sheet dated (followed by nine supplementary charge sheets), subsequent materials unearthed during probe sufficiently connected him to the crime, warranting his arraignment as an accused.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the crime in question. In fact, he has no connection with the crime. According to the learned counsel, the

present applicant has not named in any charge-sheet except the eighth supplementary charge-sheet. He would submit that in the case at hand, there were total 97 accused persons and most of the witnesses have already been enlarged on regular bail by the Supreme Court as also this Court. According to the learned counsel, 29 accused persons, who were the Excise Officers, were released on anticipatory bail by the Supreme Court. Learned counsel would submit that in the case in hand there were 1251 witnesses and there is a volume-ness of the documents in relating to the crime in question. Learned counsel would submit that the main accused persons namely Anwar Dhebar, Chaitnya Baghel, Dipen Chawda, etc., were already released on bail. He would submit that the applicant is in detention since 17/07/2026. He would submit that no recovery of any incriminating material has been made from the applicant.

5. Learned counsel further submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case, as no money was ever handled or received by him, nor has any incriminating material, unaccounted money, illegal liquor or counterfeit hologram been recovered from his possession. The applicant was never posted in the Excise Department or associated with any excise or liquor-related activities. His implication is based solely on the alleged statement of Devendra Dadsena, a worker at the Congress Bhawan, who was coerced into making a false statement and has subsequently retracted the same. Further, there is no independent corroboration of the statements of the co-accused. Learned counsel would submit that in absence of any specific allegation or incriminating material connecting the applicant with the alleged offences his implication is wholly unsubstantiated. Even there is no allegation that the

applicant manipulated the excise policy. Learned counsel would submit that upon whose statement the applicant has been made as an accused namely; Lakshminarayan Bansal has not been arrested in the crime in question and the authorities are acting in pick & choose manner that too on their whims and fancies. He would submit that the applicant is a sexagenarian and is suffering several ailments. From Annexure-A/8 i.e. basis of arrest of the applicant, it is manifest that the authorities are acting in a cavalier manner because in point 2 they have pasted the reasons of arrest of other co-accused. Thus, the applicant may be released on regular bail.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the aforesaid submission. He would submit that sufficient material has been collected showing the involvement of the applicant in receiving and handling the scam money relating to the subject crime. Learned counsel for the State submits that the applicant was actively involved in channelising the proceeds of various scams, particularly the alleged liquor scam. It is alleged that Lakshminarayan Bansal alias Pappu Bansal contacted the applicant for instructions regarding cash deliveries and, on his directions, delivered the cash to Devendra Dadsena and Pappu Bansal estimated that approximately Rs. 1,000 crore was delivered in this manner, based on repeated cash consignments, although no written accounts were maintained. Further, Devendra Dadsena, in his earlier statements, alleged that he received cash under the applicant's instructions, communicated its receipt through Phone provided by the applicant and obtained further directions regarding its handling and distribution. Thus, the applicant is not entitled for bail. However, he categorically submitted that no seizure has been made from the present applicant. Learned counsel has also

not disputed the fact that several co-accused persons have already been released on regular and anticipatory bail by the Supreme Court as well as this Court.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed before this Court.

8. Upon perusal of the material placed before this Court, this Court finds that the applicant was not named in the FIR and has been implicated subsequently in the later supplementary charge-sheet. The prosecution case against the applicant appears to be founded predominantly upon documentary evidence, which is already in possession of the investigating agency. No recovery is stated to be pending from the Applicant and no specific overt act has been attributed to him in the FIR.

9. This Court further takes note of the fact that most of the co-accused persons have been released on regular and anticipatory bail by the Supreme Court and this Court**,** including those stated to be principal accused. The principle of parity, therefore, also operates in favour of the applicant. This Court also takes note of the fact that the applicant is in custody since 17.07.2026 and the trial, involving a large number of witnesses and voluminous documentary records, is likely to consume considerable time. Thus, this Court is inclined to release the applicant on regular bail.

10. Let applicant, **Ramgopal Agrawal,** involved in FIR No. 04 of 2024 dated 17.01.2024 registered by the Economic Offences Wing/Anti-Corruption Bureau, Chhattisgarh, for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 7 and 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 be released on bail upon his furnishing a

personal bond in the sum of ₹1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) along with two local sureties of the like amount, to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court, subject to the following stringent conditions so as to ensure the fair, smooth and expeditious conduct of the trial:

> *(a) he shall surrender his passport, if any, before the Trial Court;*
> *(b) The applicant must cooperate with the investigation and the trial proceedings;*
> *(c) he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case;*
> *(d) he shall commit no offence whatsoever during the period he is on bail;*
> *(e) in case of change of residential address and/or mobile number, the same shall be intimated to the Court concerned by way of an affidavit; and*
> *(f) any stringent conditions as may be imposed by the trial court.*
> *Any violation of the above conditions will entitle the prosecution to move application for cancellation of bail which shall be considered promptly and on merits.*

11. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are confined strictly to the adjudication of the present bail application. Nothing stated in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The learned Trial Court shall proceed with the matter independently and uninfluenced by any of the observations contained in this order.

12. Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**.

SD/-
(Bibhu Datta Guru)
Judge

Gowri/
Amardeep