CGHC010429122026 2026:CGHC:46791

NAFR

PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Digitally signed by PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Date: 2026.11.04 19:23:08 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1853 of 2026

- Dhananjay Pal S/o Shri Laxmi Narayan Pal Aged About 29 Years R/o H.No. 50/215, Gajara Basti, Banki Mongra, District- Korba (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station City Kotwali, District- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent

For Applicant	:	Ms. Sejal Makkad, Advocate
For Respondent-State	:	Ms. Sharmila Singhai, Addl. Advocate General with Ms. Avelin Juneja, Panel Lawyer

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 he apprehends his arrest in connection with Crime No. 45/2025 registered at Police Station- City Kotwali, District Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5) and 111 Bhartiya Nyay Samhita, 2023.

2. As per case of prosecution, based on the F.I.R. lodged on 23.03.2025, police of police station City Kotwali received information concerning alleged cyber fraud transactions through multiple bank accounts. It is alleged that 68 complainants/ victims are related to this cyber fraud and an amount of Rs. 18,96,581 was deposited in 41 accounts of Kotak Mahindra Bank, Raipur.

According to the investigation and the Sessions Court order, Kotak Mahindra Bank Account No. 0513239416 (IFSC KKBK0006407) stated to be recorded in the name of applicant, which was allegedly used in the cyber fraud.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that applicant has been falsely implicated in the crime. He has not committed any offence as alleged. Applicant is not related to any of the co-accused persons. She also pointed out that seven co-accused persons have been granted bail by this Court and four co-accused from the Supreme Court. Hence, applicant may also be granted anticipatory bail. It is also contention of learned counsel for applicant that the notice sent by the concerned police station to the applicant was not received in time and therefore he did not appear before the concerned police station.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the submission of counsel for applicant and would submit that it is case of cyber fraud. The bank account of the applicant has been used in commission of cyber offence. According to the case diary, sum of Rs. 91 Lakh has been deposited in the account of applicant out of which 90 Lakh has been deducted.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for applicant made submission that amount of Rs. 90 Lakh is business related transaction from the account of applicant.

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

7. Perusal of bail application would show that applicant has not enclosed any document which shows that transaction of ₹ 90 Lakh is towards any business transaction or from legal transaction. Even if contents of the F.I.R. is to be considered, a sum of ₹ 18,96,581/- is transferred from 41 accounts.

8. On due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation, submission of learned counsel for the parties, and further considering the transaction of Rs. 90 Lakh from the account of applicant, I do not find present to be a fit case to allow this application.

9. Accordingly, bail application is rejected.

Sd/-

(**Parth Prateem Sahu**)
JUDGE

pwn