



2026:CGHC:3619



2026:CGHC:3619

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 744 of 2026

Preetesh Shukla S/o Lalji Shukla Aged About 32 Years R/o N E- 61,
Chachai, District- Anuppur (M.P.)

... Applicant(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station-
Tikrapara, Raipur, District- Raipur C.G.

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant(s) : Mr. Veer Verma, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Priyank Rath, G.A.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

21/01/2026

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 229/2025 registered at Police Station Tikrapara, Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 111, 3(5) of



BNS.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on information received through the Cyber Crime Reporting Portal regarding misuse of 54 RBL Bank accounts for cyber fraud, Crime No. 229/2025 was registered at Police Station Tikrapara, Raipur under relevant provisions of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and transferred to Range Cyber Police Station, Raipur for investigation. During investigation, it was found that ₹1,49,001/- was credited in the RBL Bank account of accused Anil Kumar Devangan, which included a cyber-fraud transaction of ₹28,000/- reported by the complainant on the Government Cyber Crime Portal. The accused disclosed that he opened the said bank account on commission, out of which ₹5,000/- was paid to the present applicant Preetesh Shukla. On the basis of this disclosure and material collected, the involvement of the present applicant was found, leading to his arrest. After completion of investigation, charge-sheet has been filed and the case is pending before the learned Special Judge (SC/ST), Raipur. Hence, the bail application.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has not committed any offence and he has been falsely implicated in offence in question. He further submits that identically situated co-accused persons, namely, Vikas Madhwani, Jitendra Bagh, Priya Sori and Bhavika Harchandani have already been granted bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide common order dated 18.12.2025



in Criminal Appeal No.5615/2025 arising out of SLP (Crl.) No.16298/2025, Criminal Appeal No.5616/2025 arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 17964/2025, Criminal Appeal No. 5617/2025 arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 19330/2025 and Criminal Appeal No. 5618/2025 arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 19243/2025, respectively. The applicant is in jail since 23.08.2025, the applicant has no criminal antecedent, charge-sheet has been filed and the trial is likely to take some time for its conclusion. Therefore, he prays for grant of bail to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the charge-sheet has been filed in the present case. He further submits that the allegation against the applicant is that he was involved in the opening and use of an RBL Bank account for cyber fraud, having received Rs.5,000/- as commission from the co-accused for facilitating the said account, which was used to receive proceeds of cyber crime. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled for grant of bail.
5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of offence, period of detention of the applicant since 23.08.2025, the fact that though the applicant allegedly involved in the opening and use of an RBL Bank account for cyber fraud, having received Rs.5,000/- as commission from the co-



accused for facilitating the said account, which was used to receive proceeds of cyber crime, but considering the fact that identically situated co-accused persons, namely, Vikas Madhwani, Jitendra Bagh, Priya Sori and Bhavika Harchandani have already been granted bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide common order dated 18.12.2025 in Criminal Appeal No.5615/2025 arising out of SLP (Crl.) No.16298/2025, Criminal Appeal No.5616/2025 arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 17964/2025, Criminal Appeal No. 5617/2025 arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 19330/2025 and Criminal Appeal No. 5618/2025 arising out of SLP (Crl.) No. 19243/2025, respectively, further the applicant has no criminal antecedent and charge-sheet has been filed, this Court is of the view that the applicant is entitled to be released on bail in this case.

7. Accordingly, the application is **allowed**.
8. Let the Applicant-**Preetesh Shukla**, involved in Crime No. 229/2025 registered at Police Station Tikrapara, Raipur, District-Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 111, 3(5) of BNS, be released on bail on his furnishing a **personal bond** with **two local sureties** in the like sum to the satisfaction of the Court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be



open for the trial court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.

(ii) The applicant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the trial court may proceed against him under Section 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(iii) In case, the applicant misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure his presence, proclamation under Section 84 of BNSS. is issued and the applicant fails to appear before the court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against him, in accordance with law, under Section 209 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(iv) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case, (ii) framing of charge and (iii) recording of statement under Section 351 of BNSS. If in the opinion of the trial court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the trial court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

9. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court for necessary information and compliance.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE