CGHC010421482026 2026:CGHC:46774

RAVI SHANKAR MANDAVI Digitally signed by RAVI SHANKAR MANDAVI

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1794 of 2026

Yadunath Patel S/o Padumram Patel Aged About 56 Years R/o Village Bade Devgaon, P.S. And Tahsil - Kharsia, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh (As Per Correct Details)

... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Sakti, District Sakti Chhattisgarh

... Respondent

(Cause title is taken from CIS)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Sachin Nidhi, Advocate
For State/Respondent	:	Ms. Sharmila Sanghai, Addl. A.G. with Ms. Prachi Singh, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Order on Board

04/11/2026

1. Applicant has preferred First bail 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.

354/2017 registered at Police Station- Sakti, District Sakti (C.G.) for offence punishable under Section 419 and 420 of IPC.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that complainant Kartikram Yadav filed a written complaint with the Inspector General of Police, Bilaspur Range, stating that his mother had taken policy of Life Insurance Corporation of India vide policy number 383054930 in his name, and he had been paying premiums for nine years. Upon his mother's death, he stopped paying premiums. When he contacted the agent to withdraw the policy amount, he began to procrastinate. Upon filing a complaint at the police station, he came to know that the insurance policy amount had been withdrawn, but the complainant had never received the insurance amount. The total amount withdrawn by the applicant was Rs.6,650/-.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent, not involved in alleged commission of offences and he has been falsely implicated in the crime in question. He also submits that applicant has been implicated in the crime only because he being the LIC Agent has obtained the policy in the name of complainant purchased by the mother. When the complainant went to the LIC office he was intimated that the amount has already been withdrawn and thereafter the report was lodged in the year 2017. He also pointed out that as applicant has not committed any offence and till date no material has been collected by the police, so as to show prima facei involvement of

the applicant in the offence. As there is no material before the police, the applicant was not being interrogated or any steps have been taken to arrest him. When police again came to applicant for collecting the information etc., the applicant has filed bail application which came to be rejected by the impugned order. There is no other criminal antecedent registered against the applicant, hence, he may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the submission of learned counsel for applicant and would submit that according to the complaint, the allegation is against the applicant that he has withdrawn the amount. Upon putting the query learned State counsel submits that there are no documents available on record to suggest as to who had acted and instrumental in transferring the amount of the policy purchased in the name of complainant. She also submits that from the case diary it is appearing that the applicant when tried to contact was not found.
5. At this stage, counsel for the applicant would submit that an amount of Rs.6,650/- towards the policy has been returned by co-accused Ram Kumar Patel.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the documents enclosed along with bail application.
7. On due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation, submission of learned counsel for the parties, further considering that there are no documents available in case diary to suggest as to who had acted and instrumental in

transferring the amount of the policy purchased in the name of complainant and further that there is no other criminal antecedent registered against the applicant, without commenting anything on merits, I am inclined to allow this anticipatory bail application.

8. Accordingly, application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of arrest of applicant in connection with the aforementioned crime number, he shall be released on anticipatory bail by the Officer arresting him on his executing a personal bond in the sum of ₹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; and

(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.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)

JUDGE

Ravi Mandavi