CGHC010426742026 2026:CGHC:46640

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 10480 of 2026

- Yogesh @ Lalla Yadav Son Of Late Santosh Kumar Yadav, Aged About 21 Years R/o Sukwari Bazar, Kaleshwar Mandir, In Front Of Pawan Bhawan, Police Station Gudiyari, District Raipur, C.G.

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Rakhi, Distt. Raipur C.G.

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Patel, Advocate
For State : Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

04.11.2026

1. This is the second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 0157/2025 registered at Police Station Rakhi, District Raipur (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 111 and 3(5) of BNS.

2. Earlier, first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 3588 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 16.06.2026.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that information was received through the Samanvaya Portal of the Indian Cyber Crime Coordination Centre (I4C),

Ministry of Home Affairs, regarding several mule bank accounts maintained in Punjab National Bank, Raipur, which were allegedly used for receiving and transferring money obtained through cyber fraud. During investigation, it was revealed that the accused persons had allegedly procured and facilitated the use of bank accounts, ATM cards, passbooks and other banking credentials for consideration and such accounts were used for routing and concealing proceeds of cyber fraud and online gaming-related transactions. The investigation further revealed that bank account No. 7685000100035258, belonging to the present applicant, reflected credits of ₹17,85,765/- and was allegedly used for receiving and routing proceeds of cyber fraud. After investigation, the charge-sheet was filed against the accused persons.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected by a coordinate Bench of this Court on merits. However, the present second bail application has been preferred on the ground of subsequent change in circumstances, as the bail applications of co-accused persons, namely, Praveen Soni and Abdul Hidayat Khan, were also rejected by a coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC Nos. 3086/2026 and 3646/2026, respectively, vide order dated 16.06.2026. Thereafter, the said co-accused persons preferred petitions before the Hon’ble Supreme Court in SLP (Criminal) Nos. 12985/2026 and 13826/2026, respectively and the Hon’ble Supreme Court, vide order dated 02.09.2026, granted them bail. He would further submit that the present applicant is similarly situated and therefore, deserves to be enlarged on bail on the ground of parity.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant

of bail and submit that the earlier bail application of the present applicant was rejected by a coordinate Bench of this Court on merits, vide order dated 16.06.2026. However, he could not dispute the fact that similarly situated co-accused persons, namely, Praveen Soni and Abdul Hidayat Khan, have been granted bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 02.09.2026 in SLP (Criminal) Nos. 12985/2026 and 13826/2026, respectively.

6. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offences alleged against the applicant and the fact that the bail applications of co-accused persons, namely, Praveen Soni and Abdul Hidayat Khan, were rejected by a coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC Nos. 3086/2026 and 3646/2026, respectively, vide order dated 16.06.2026, thereafter, the said co-accused persons preferred petitions before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Criminal) Nos. 12985/2026 and 13826/2026, respectively and the Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide order dated 02.09.2026, granted them bail, this Court is of the view that the applicant is also entitled to the benefit of parity. Accordingly, without further commenting upon the merits of the case, I am inclined to grant bail to the applicant.

8. Accordingly, the regular bail application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

(i) he 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 from disclosing such fact to the Court;

(ii) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, &

(iii) he shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant