CGHC010426872026 2026:CGHC:46824

NAFR

PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Digitally signed by PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Date: 2026.11.04 19:22:43 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1861 of 2026

- Kunti Devi Jangde W/o Ramdas Jangde Aged About 59 Years R/o Lig 74, R.P. Nagar, Korba, Tahsil And District Korba C.G.

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. Pasan, District Korba C.G.

... Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Vikas Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For Respondent-State	:	Mr. H.A.P.S. Bhatia, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

ORDER ON BOARD

04/11/2026

1. Applicant has preferred this application under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail as she apprehends her arrest in connection with Crime No. 57/2025 registered at Police Station- Pasan, District Korba (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420 of IPC.

2. Case of prosecution, in brief, is that on 16.04.2025, complainant Pratap Singh Maravi lodged a written complaint at Police Station Pasan, alleging that accused Kunti Devi induced him to pay money on the false promise of providing a job as a Supervisor/Manager at a country liquor shop. Believing her assurance that she could arrange employment for his nephew, Lal Bahadur Singh, complainant paid a total sum of ₹2,50,000/- in installments through online transactions. However, instead of providing the job, accused arranged for Lal Bahadur Singh to work as a salesman at a country liquor shop for six days, during which his biometric

attendance was also recorded with the Excise Department. Despite repeated demands, neither was the job was provided nor was the amount refunded. Based on the report, aforementioned crime was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that applicant is a lady, she has been falsely implicated in the crime, she has not committed any offence as alleged. However, as a precautionary measure an amount of ₹ 2,50,000 has been returned to complainant. There is no criminal antecedent against applicant, hence, she may be granted anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the submission of counsel for applicant and would submit that based on the observation made by this Court, he has verified the fact of refunding of amount of ₹ 2,50,000 and according to his instruction received from the concerned police station, the said amount has been repaid by the applicant.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the documents enclosed along with bail application.

6. On due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation, submission of learned counsel for the parties, without commenting anything on merits, I am inclined to allow this anticipatory bail application.

7. Accordingly, application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of arrest of applicant in connection with the crime in question (57/2025), she shall be released on anticipatory bail by the Officer arresting her on her 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 herself 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 her by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

8. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-

(**Parth Prateem Sahu**)
JUDGE

pwn