CGHC010432522026 2026:CGHC:47081

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 10486 of 2026

- Vivek Tandan @ Vikky Tandan S/o. Santosh Tandan Aged About 23 Years R/o. Ward No. 12, Mini Mata Nagar, Talapara, Bilaspur Tahsil And District Bilaspur C.G.

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer (S.H.O.) P.S. -Cyber Range, District Bilaspur C.G.

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Shalvin Sharma, Advocate holding the brief of Mr. Devershi Thakur, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Dy. Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

16.11.2026

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. 16/2025 registered at Police Station Cyber Range, District Bilaspur (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 61(2), 317(5), 318(4), 323 and 111(4) of BNS.

2. Earlier, first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 929 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 26.02.2026.

3. As per the prosecution case, upon inspection of the mule accounts through the JMIS Portal of the Central Government, it was found that there were

multiple complaints with regard to bank account of the applicant and other co-accused persons. During the period from 09.04.2024 to 31.03.2025, a total amount of Rs. 12,79,144/- was transacted by deceiving members of the general public. Thereafter, Police has registered an aforesaid offence against the present applicant and arrested on 15.07.2025.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that though first bail application was rejected on merits in MCRC No. 929 of 2026 vide order dated 26.02.2026, but this application has been moved as there is no substantial progress in the trial and till date single witness has not been examined. He would pray for grant of bail to the present applicant.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail application. Mr. Shrivastava would submit that present applicant is allegedly involved in committing cyber fraud to the tune of Rs. 12,79,144/-, whereby members of the general public have been cheated, therefore, he is not entitled for grant of regular bail in the present case.

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 allegation levelled against the present applicant and fact that multiple complaints of online financial fraud were registered with respect to the bank accounts allegedly operated by the applicant and co-accused persons. The applicant is also alleged to have disclosed his involvement in committing online fraud along with his associates by inducing victims to transfer money into the bank accounts of the applicant and the co-accused. The SIM cards allegedly used in the commission of the offence were also

seized during investigation. The aforesaid material *prima facie* indicates active involvement of the applicant in the alleged cyber fraud involving multiple victims.

8. In view of the above-discussed facts and circumstances of the case, material collected during investigation and findings recorded while rejecting first bail application particularly in paragraph 6, I find no substantial change in circumstances warranting reconsideration of the earlier order.

9. Accordingly, instant bail application is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant