CGHC010414062026 2026:CGHC:45941

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 10264 of 2026

1 - Raviraj Singh S/o Raju Singh Aged About 27 Years R/o Sirodaniya, P.S. Devgarh Distt- Rajsamand (Rajasthan)

...Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Cyber Police Station Raigarh Distt- Raigarh (C.G.) **... Non-applicant**

For Applicant	:	Mr. Rahul Goswami, Advocate
For Non-applicant	:	Mr.Dharmesh Shrivastava, Dy. AG

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order On Board

30.10.2026

1) This is the Second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 02/2026 registered at Police Station Cyber, District Raigarh (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 308(6), 112(2), 61(2) of BNS and Section 66(D) of the Information Technology Act. Earlier first bail application of the applicant bearing

MCRC No.4888 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 10.07.2026.

2) The prosecution case, in brief, is that the complainant, Narendra Singh Thakur, lodged an FIR alleging that he received a phone call from an unknown person claiming to be associated with the TRAI Department. The caller falsely informed him that another Jio mobile number registered in his name was being used for illegal activities and, on this pretext, induced him to transfer a total amount of Rs.36,97,117/- through multiple UPI transactions on different dates. On the basis of said complaint, the police registered the FIR and commenced investigation into the alleged cyber fraud. Hence, the present bail application.

3) Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the offence in question. He further submits that no specific allegation has been levelled against the present applicant either in the FIR or during the course of investigation, and no specific overt act has been attributed to him. He would further submit that the applicant is in jail since 22.04.2026, has no criminal antecedents, and the charge-sheet has not yet been filed. It is contended that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits in MCRC No. 4888 of 2026 vide order dated 10.07.2026. Therefore, he prays for grant of bail to the applicant.

4) On the other hand, learned State Counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the charge-sheet has not yet been filed in the present case. He further submits that the applicant is allegedly involved in a cyber fraud, wherein the complainant was induced, through a fraudulent phone call impersonating an official of the TRAI Department,

to transfer a total amount of Rs.36,97,117/- through multiple UPI transactions. He would further submit that, during the course of investigation, the involvement of the present applicant in facilitating and participating in the commission of the alleged offence surfaced, leading to his implication in the case. 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, the nature and gravity of the offence, and the material available in the case diary, particularly the fact that the complainant was allegedly cheated of a substantial amount of Rs.36,97,117/- through a well-organized cyber fraud involving impersonation of public officials of the TRAI Department and the threat of digital arrest; the material collected during investigation prima facie indicating the involvement of the present applicant in facilitating the commission of the alleged offence; the memorandum statements of the accused persons; the recovery of electronic devices; and the allegation that the applicant shared the proceeds of the crime, this Court finds that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. Though the applicant is in jail since 22.04.2026 and has no criminal antecedents, these circumstances, at this stage, are not sufficient to warrant his release on bail. Further, the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits by a

detailed order passed in MCRC No.4888 of 2026, and the applicant has failed to demonstrate any substantial change in circumstances or any fresh ground warranting reconsideration of the earlier order. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected.**

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Rekha