CGHC010405812026 2026:CGHC:45223

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9994 of 2026

1 - Yuvraj Khandu Athavale Son Of Khandu Manohar Athavale Aged About 21 Years (Wrongly Mentioned As Khandu Athavale), R/o Vaddegaon, Post - Ichgaon, Tahsil - Mohol, District - Solapur - Ichgaon (Maharashtra)

... Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through - Station House Officer, Police Station - Cyber Range, Raipur, District - Raipur, Chhattisgarh. **... Non-applicant**

For Applicant	:	Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate
For Non-applicant	:	Mr. Kawaljeet Singh Saini, Dy. GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order On Board

27.10.2026

1) This is the Second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant arrested in connection with Crime No.02/2025 registered at Police Station - Cyber Range, Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 3(5), 238 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) and Section 66(D) of Information

Technology Act. Earlier first bail application of the applicant bearing MCRC No.4461 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 13.05.2026.

2) As per the prosecution story, complainant Ramavatar Verma lodged a complaint alleging that on 24.12.2025, Iti Shukla received a message containing a hyperlink regarding payment of a traffic fine. Upon clicking the link, Rs. 2,94,342.51 was fraudulently debited from her State Bank of India account on 25.12.2025. On the basis of the complaint, FIR No. 02/2025 was registered at Cyber Police Station, Raipur, under Section 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Section 66D of the Information Technology Act, and the applicant was arrested during the investigation. Hence, the bail application.

3) Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case and has no role in the alleged cyber fraud. He further submits that the applicant was merely an employee of the main accused, Raju Sharma, whose bail application was rejected by this Court vide order dated 24.04.2026 passed in MCRC No. 2591/2026. He also submits that the applicant received only Rs. 400/- from the main accused for sending multiple messages. It is also submitted that earlier first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits in MCRC No.4461 of 2026 vide order dated 13.05.2026. He would contend that the applicant is in jail since 30.12.2025 and the trial is likely to take some time for its conclusion, therefore, he prays for grant of bail to the present applicant.

4) On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the bail application of the main accused, Raju Sharma, has already been rejected by this Court vide order dated

24.04.2026 passed in MCRC No. 2591/2026. He further submits that the applicant and co-accused were involved in organized cybercrime. He would contend that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits and there is no substantial change in circumstances warranting reconsideration of the prayer for bail. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled to be enlarged on bail.

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

6) Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits by a detailed order passed in MCRC No. 4461 of 2026; the bail application of the main accused, Raju Sharma, has also been rejected by this Court vide order dated 24.04.2026 passed in MCRC No. 2591/2026; and the allegations indicate the involvement of the applicant and other co-accused persons in organized cybercrime, this Court finds no sufficient ground to take a different view. The applicant has not been able to demonstrate any substantial change in circumstances or any new ground warranting reconsideration of the earlier decision. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations and the rejection of the bail application of the main accused, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected.**

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Rekha