

MHGA010001142026



**IN THE COURT OF AD-HOC DISTRICT JUDGE-1 &
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, GADCHIROLI**

(Presided over by Shri V. S. Khot)

....

Cri. Bail Appln. No. 19/2026

Ankit S/o. Kanhayalal Giri

Age: 23 yrs, Occupation : Student,
R/o Anarikapura, Tah- Gyanpura,
Dist- Sant Ravidasnagar, Bhadohi,
(Uttar Pradesh).

.. Applicant

..Versus..

State of Maharashtra

Through P.S.O. P.S. Gadchiroli
Tah & Dist. Gadchiroli.

...Non-Applicant

Order below Exh.1

(Passed on 12th day of March, 2026)

1] This application is filed by the applicant for releasing him on bail under the provisions of Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023.

2] The applicant's case can be stated as under :

The applicant is a resident of Anarikapura, Tah. Gyanpura, Dist. Sant Ravidas Nagar, Bhadohi (Uttar Pradesh). He is an innocent person and a law abiding citizen of India. He is taking education in law faculty. Police Station Officer, Police

Station, Gadchiroli registered the offence bearing no.754/2025 on 25.08.2025 under Sections 319(2), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2) and 62 of the BNS, 2023. The applicant came to be arrested and remanded into custody. It is alleged by the informant/complainant that he received one phone call from unknown person. The said unknown person told to him that he is P.A. to Prime Minister Shri Narendra Modi and he is talking from PMO office. The Prime Minister wants to shoulder some responsibility towards the informant and, therefore, he require the complainant's e-mail Id and Adhar Card which were provided by the complainant. The accused by showing his name as Tanmay Mehata made phone call and whatsapp messages to the informant and demanded Rs.25,00,000/- and assuring Rajya Sabha membership/position to him. Meantime, the informant received letter from PMO office mentioning therein the date of meeting as 28.08.2025. The complainant suspected the letter and, therefore, he enquired with PMO office and came to know that said letter was not sent from office of PMO. The informant informed the incident to the police. The police started investigation and during investigation arrested present applicant and since then, he is in jail.

3] The applicant is 23 years old and pursuing LLB first year at PT. Harish Chandra Mishra (nagraha) Vidhi Mahavidhyalaya, Asepur, Handia, Prayagraj. Right to education is a fundamental right guaranteed under the Constitution of India. His incarceration would defeat said fundamental right.

He is not a previous convict and he is not involved in any case except the present case. He is a permanent resident of Bihrojpur, Tah. Gyanpura, Dist. Sant Ravidas Nagar, Bhadohi (Uttar Pradesh). There is no chance of his absconding. He is ready to observe the terms and conditions of bail and he is required to be enlarged on bail.

4] The applicant would remain present on the dates of the trial and before the Investigating Officer if required. He would not interfere into recording of evidence and would not impose any burden upon the witness. He would co-operate the Court and the Investigating Officer. He is ready to abide by all the conditions imposed by this Court while granting bail to him. He has not filed any application before any forum/Court for bail in said crime. He has not approached to Hon'ble High Court or Hon'ble Apex Court in that regard. The applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail. The applicant prayed for the bail.

5] The say of the other side came to be invited. The other side submitted the say and contended that the offence registered against the applicant is serious in nature. He is a resident of another State, therefore, he can be absconded. He can resort to the same type of crimes after enlarging on bail. He is having prima facie role in the commission of the offence. One co-accused Prashant purchased the SIM and this applicant inserted the SIM in his phone. He is having relationship with the co-accused Prashant. There is a prima facie evidence available against the applicant. The police has seized several

mobile phones and SIMs. He made phone call to the informant and told his name as Tanmay Mehata, R/o. Delhi and demanded Rs.25,00,000/-. He also asked accused Prashant to purchase fake SIM cards. The applicant and co-accused Prashant went to Jabalpur and made contact with informant Ashok Nete and demanded money. The offence is serious and committed at higher level. The applicant is not entitled to be enlarged on bail. The bail application is devoid of any merits and liable to be rejected. The prosecution prayed for rejection of the application.

6] In view of rival contentions of the applicant and prosecution following points arise for my determination and I have recorded my findings subject to the reasons as mentioned hereinafter.

	Points	Findings
1.	Whether the applicant/accused is entitled to be released on bail as prayed ?	.. No.
2.	What order ?	As per final order

Reasons

As to point nos.1 & 2 :-

7] This application is filed for bail under the provisions of Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023. The applicant is in jail. The applicant is ready to furnish the bail. He has not committed any offence and ready to attend the trial. He is ready to observe the

conditions imposed by the Court. The evidence against him is not palpable. He is entitled to be enlarged on bail. On the contrary, the prosecution submitted that there is an electronic evidence available against the applicant. He has demanded Rs.25,00,000/- to the informant. He can commit similar crime if released on bail. He is a resident of another State, therefore, there is a chance of his absconding. The bail application is liable to be rejected.

8] The accused has applied for bail. The accused has submitted that he is not a previous convict and has not involved in any case of this nature except the present case. The perusal of the record shows that there is one case pending in Delhi Court. The accused was brought before this Court under the patronage of production of warrant issued by CJM/JMFC, Gadchiroli. His transfer in this crime was allowed by the CJM, New Delhi. It ultimately shows that he is facing criminal case at Delhi, but he made a false statement that he is not involved in another case. The similar crime is pending at New Delhi. The accused is detained in Tihar jail in Crime No.226/2025 under Sections 318(2), 336(2), 340(2), 238, 61(2) read with Section 3(5) of the BNS, 2023, but he made the fictitious statement in the bail application that he is not concerned in any similar case in India. This fact alone is sufficient to reject the bail application of the applicant.

9] The prosecution/ police has leveled the allegations of cheating and forgery against this applicant. It is contention of

the prosecution that the accused persons made phone call to the informant many a times and tried to cheat him. They demanded Rs.25,00,000/- to him. It is contention of the prosecution that he committed forgery for cheating the informant. The facts and circumstances of the case show that the accused persons tried to cheat the ex- MP. They sent e-mail that the Hon'ble Prime Minister is desirous to meet with the informant. The offence is committed at a higher level. The accused persons cheated the informant in the name of Hon'ble Prime Minister and PMO office, Delhi. The applicant is a prima facie concerned with the commission of offence. The applicant purchased the SIM Card which was used for calling the applicant. So, there is a prima facie material of involvement of applicant in the commission of offence. This aspect goes against the case of the applicant.

10] The applicant appears to be a criminal in nature. He is concerned in one another crime at New Delhi. He is detained in Tihar Jail. The pendency of criminal case against the applicant goes against the bail application.

11] The perusal of the case papers shows that the offence is committed at higher level and it is multi-facet offence. The investigation is required to be carried out strictly. He tried to cheat the informant in the name of Hon'ble Prime Minister and PMO office. The offence is serious one and the arena of offence is large. The investigation is still going on and the charge-sheet is not yet filed. In such circumstances, it is not desirable to release the accused on bail. The bail application is liable to be rejected.

12] In this case the allegations leveled against the applicant are serious in nature. The investigation is in progress. The accused/applicant is having criminal background and facing one crime at Delhi. The accused/applicant had made untrue statement that he is having no criminal antecedents before this Court. This fact shows the nature of the applicant. If the applicant is released on bail, then there is a strong chance of his absconding and intervening in the investigation. The bail application of the applicant is having no fate/future in view of above mentioned discussion. The bail application of the applicant is liable to be rejected. Therefore, my answer to point nos.1 and 2 are in negative and I am inclined to pass, resulting in rejection of bail application.

ORDER

- 1] The bail application stands rejected.
- 2] The bail application stands disposed of and it be annexed to the charge-sheet after charge-sheet is filed.

Date : 12.03.2026

Sd/-
(**Vishwas S. Khot**)
Ad-Hoc District Judge-1 and
Additional Sessions Judge,
Gadchiroli