CGHC010432692026

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 10622 of 2026

Teekaram Shriwas S/o Bhagirathi Shriwas Aged About 29 Years R/o Village Mudpar, Police Station And Tahsil - Nawagarh, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

... Applicant(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station - Nawagarh, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

... Non-Applicant(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Kashish Saluja, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/State	:	Mr. Arvind Dubey, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

05/11/2026

1. This is the second bail application filed by the applicant under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 128 of 2026 registered at Police Station Nawagarh, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 318(4), 111(2) read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Earlier, the first bail application of the applicant was rejected by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC No. 4784 of 2026 vide order dated 10.07.2026 on merits. Hence, the present second bail application.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that during the period from 2019 to 2024, the present applicant, along with co-accused Rajeshwar Sahu and Narendra Mathur, in furtherance of their common intention, allegedly fraudulently opened six bank accounts in HDFC Bank, Racchhabhatha Branch, Nawagarh, in the names of Gautam Dewangan, Nanki God and Tulsi God and three other persons for the purpose of receiving and depositing the proceeds of cyber fraud. It is further alleged that the applicants received commission for facilitating the opening of such bank accounts and an amount of Rs.20,40,244/- obtained through cyber fraud was credited into the said accounts during the period from 12.11.2023 to 24.09.2024. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the present crime was registered against the applicant along with the co-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 and the new grounds for filing the present second bail application are that no incriminating article, cash amount or alleged proceeds of crime have been seized or recovered from the possession of the applicant. The prosecution has also not effected any recovery of the alleged commission from him. He would

further submit that the alleged amount of Rs.20,40,244/- is stated to have been credited into various bank accounts and the prosecution is required to establish the applicant's individual connection with the said transactions by legally admissible evidence. It is further submitted that the co-accused, namely, Nanki Gond and Gautam Dewangan, have subsequently been granted regular bail vide orders dated 19.08.2026 and 22.09.2026, respectively, which constitute subsequent developments warranting fresh consideration of the applicant's prayer for bail. He would further submit that the applicant's case is required to be assessed on the basis of the evidence specifically attributed to him and mere association with the co-accused persons or allegation of common intention cannot, by itself, establish his individual involvement in the alleged offence. He would also submit that co-accused Lakhan Lal Sultan has been granted anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC No. 987 of 2026 vide order dated 13.07.2026. The applicant is in jail since 23.04.2026, has no criminal antecedents and the trial is likely to take some time to conclude. Thus, he prays for grant of bail to the applicant.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant of bail and submit that the first bail application of the applicant has already been rejected by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC No. 4784 of 2026 vide order dated 10.07.2026 on merits. He would further submit that no substantial change in circumstances has been brought on record so as to warrant

reconsideration of the applicant's prayer for grant of regular bail. Therefore, the present second bail application deserves to be rejected.

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

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of allegations levelled against the applicant, the material collected during the course of investigation and further considering the fact that the first bail application of the applicant has already been rejected by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC No. 4784 of 2026 vide order dated 10.07.2026 on merits, this Court is of the considered opinion that the subsequent developments and grounds raised by the applicant do not constitute such a substantial change in circumstances as would warrant reconsideration of the prayer for grant of regular bail. The subsequent grant of bail to the co-accused persons, by itself, does not entitle the applicant to claim parity in the facts and circumstances of the present case. Therefore, this Court does not find any good ground to entertain the present second bail application.

8. Accordingly the present second bail application of the applicant is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Kunal