CGHC010426512026 2026:CGHC:46396

REKHA SINGH

Digitally signed by REKHA SINGH
DN: cn=REKHA SINGH, ou=HIGH COURT, o=HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, st=Chhattisgarh, c=IN
Date: 2026.11.03 14:27:08 +0530

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 10386 of 2026

1 - Raja Khunte S/o Bhakturam Khunte Aged About 35 Years R/o Village Junwani P.S. Palari, District Balodabazar C.G. At Present Resident Of Village Mauha, P.S. Dharsiwa, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer Police Station Dharsiwa District Raipur (C.G.) **... Non-applicant**

For Applicant	:	Mr. Banhiman Roy, Advocate
For Non-applicant	:	Mr. Keshav Gupta, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order On Board

03.11.2026

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 who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 124/2026 registered at Police Station Dharsiwa, District Raipur (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code. Earlier first bail application of the applicant bearing MCRC No.7348 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 13.08.2026.

2) The case of the prosecution, in a nutshell, is that the complainant submitted a written complaint to the concerned Police Station alleging that the accused persons had received a total amount of Rs. 40 lakhs through cheques issued by the complainant and his wife for the purpose of making fixed deposits. However, the accused persons did not make the said fixed deposits. Based on the written complaint, the police registered an offence under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the IPC against the accused persons. Thereafter, the applicant was arrested in connection with the aforesaid offence. Hence, the present bail application.

3) Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the alleged crime. He would further submit that the applicant was working as an employee of IDBI Bank, Charoda Branch, District Raipur (C.G.), and has no involvement in the alleged crime. He would contend that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits in M.Cr.C. No. 7348 of 2026; however, the co-accused persons have already been enlarged on bail. He also submits that the applicant is in jail since 05.03.2026 and there has been no substantial progress in the trial. Hence, he prays for grant of bail to the applicant.

4) On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the bail application and submit that the applicant, who was employed with IDBI Bank, Charoda Branch, District Raipur (C.G.), is a named accused in the FIR and is alleged to have received, along with the co-accused persons, an amount of Rs. 40 lakhs through cheques for making fixed deposits, which were never made. He would further submit that the allegations disclose commission of serious offences under Sections

420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the IPC. He would contend that the applicant is the main accused and his first bail application was rejected on merits by a detailed order in MCRC No.7348 of 2026 vide order dated 13.08.2026. He would further contend that the co-accused persons were granted bail vide orders dated 20.07.2026 passed in M.Cr.C. Nos. 4482 of 2026, 6204 of 2026 and 5538 of 2026, much prior to the rejection of the first bail application of the applicant. He would submit that the charge-sheet was filed in June 2026 and, therefore, the ground of delay in trial is not available to the applicant. There is no substantial change in circumstances warranting reconsideration of the prayer for bail. Hence, the applicant is not entitled to be released 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 the nature and gravity of the allegations that the applicant, being an employee of IDBI Bank, Charoda Branch, District Raipur (C.G.), along with the co-accused persons, allegedly received an amount of Rs. 40 lakhs through cheques issued by the complainant and his wife for the purpose of making fixed deposits, which were never made; the applicant is a named accused in the FIR and is alleged to have played an active role in the commission of the alleged offence. It is further relevant to note that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits by a detailed order passed in M.Cr.C. No. 7348 of 2026. Though the co-accused persons have been granted bail vide orders dated 20.07.2026 but the said orders were passed much prior to

the rejection of the first bail application of the applicant. Therefore, the ground of parity was available to the applicant at the time of consideration of his earlier bail application. The charge-sheet has also been filed in June 2026, and the investigation is complete. The applicant has not been able to point out any substantial change in circumstances after rejection of his earlier bail application warranting reconsideration of his prayer for bail. Mere continuation of custody or the likelihood of delay in conclusion of the trial, in the facts of the present case, would not by itself constitute a sufficient ground for grant of bail. Accordingly, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant. Consequently, the bail application is **rejected**. However, it is expected from the concerned Trial Court that trial would be concluded at the earliest.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Rekha