CGHC010441682026 2026:CGHC:47076

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 10714 of 2026

- Jaiprakash Sriwas S/o Santosh Sriwas Aged About 28 Years R/o- Vill.- Kuriyari, P.S. Shivrinarayan, District- Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through S.H.O. P.S. City Kotwali Baloda Bazar, Dist.- Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Ravindra Sharma, Advocate
For State : Mr. Arvind Dubey, Government Advocate

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. 381/2026 registered at Police Station City Kotwali, District Baloda Bazar (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 319(2) of BNS and Section 66(D) of I.T. Act.

2. Earlier, first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 4924 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 10.07.2026.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that, pursuant to a complaint received from the Police Headquarters, Nava Raipur, with regard to suspected mule

bank accounts being used in cyber fraud cases, an inquiry was conducted into Bank Account No. 12511100008495 maintained with DCB Bank in the name of present applicant, Jai Prakash Shriwas. During the inquiry, suspicious transactions to the tune of Rs. 1,00,02,99,000/- were found to have been carried out through the said account between 01.02.2024 and 31.01.2025, which were linked to seven cyber fraud cases registered in different parts of the country. It is alleged that the applicant had provided his bank account to the co-accused persons for receiving and transferring the proceeds of cyber fraud, thereby facilitating the commission of the alleged offences.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant would submit that the present applicant has falsely been implicated. He further submits that after rejection of first bail application, 3 witnesses have been examined out of 18 witnesses and they have not supported the case of prosecution. He would further submit that the present applicant is in jail since 06.05.2026, he has no criminal antecedents and trial may take some time for its conclusion. Thus, he would pray for grant of bail to the applicant.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State would oppose the bail application. Mr. Arvind Dubey, Government Advocate would submit that there are serious allegations against the present applicant and he was involved in the commission of cyber fraud. He would further submit that the Coordinate Bench, while rejecting the first bail application, has discussed the allegations against the present applicant, particularly in paragraph 6 of the order dated 10.07.2026. He would submit that instant application deserves to be rejected.

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

7. It is a well-settled principle of law that, while entertaining a bail application, the High Court cannot conduct a mini-trial or undertake a detailed examination of the evidence. The reliability and credibility of the witnesses are matters to be assessed by the learned Trial Court during course of trial and cannot be assessed at this stage. Though three prosecution witnesses have been examined out of eighteen, the reliability and credibility of their testimonies are matters to be assessed by the learned Trial Court during course of trial and cannot be examined in detail at this stage. Further, first bail application, being MCRC No. 4924 of 2026, was rejected on merits vide order dated 10.07.2026, after taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and the allegations levelled against the present applicant, therefore, no case is made out for grant of bail.

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

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant