



2026:CGHC:10070



2026:CGHC:10070

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 1497 of 2026

Prahlad Deep S/o Babaji Deep Aged About 26 Years R/o House No. 1515,
Vsup Colony, Aishwarya Kingdom And World City, Kachna, Police Station -
Khamhardih, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh **...Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Cyber
Range, Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh **...Non-applicant**

For Applicant	: Mr. Veer Verma, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	: Ms. Anusha Naik, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

26.02.2026

1. The applicant has preferred this First Bail Application 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. 79/2025, registered at Police Station - Cyber Range, Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 111, 3(5), of the BNS.
2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the complainant lodged a report before the concerned police station alleging that the accused persons



had opened bank accounts by using forged documents and thereafter committed theft of an amount of Rs.27,27,556/- through such bank accounts. On the basis of the said complaint, the police registered an offence under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 111 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) against the accused persons, and after completion of the investigation, the present applicant was arrested in connection with the aforesaid Crime No. 79/2025 solely on the basis of the memorandum statement.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is an innocent person who has been falsely implicated in the present case, he further submits that applicant has been in judicial custody since 27.03.2025, amounting to prolonged and disproportionate detention, and the trial is likely to take considerable time owing to the involvement of multiple accused persons, resulting in inordinate delay in final disposal of the case; that the investigation is complete and the charge-sheet has already been filed before the learned trial Court, and no further recovery or custodial interrogation is required, rendering his continued detention unnecessary and violative of his fundamental right to personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India; that the alleged offences are not grave in nature and are punishable with imprisonment which may extend to less than seven years or with fine only, and the applicant poses no threat to society, nor is there any likelihood of his tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, particularly when the evidence is primarily documentary and electronic in nature; that the prosecution case relies heavily upon circumstantial evidence and statements of co-accused, which are inadmissible as substantive evidence under Section 30 of the Bharatiya Sakshya



Adhiniyam, 2023, and there is no direct evidence linking the applicant to the alleged offence; that grant of bail would not prejudice the prosecution case as the applicant is ready to furnish solvent sureties and comply with all conditions, and refusal of bail at this stage would amount to pre-trial punishment contrary to the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar* (2014) and *Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI* (2022); that the applicant reserves his right to raise additional grounds at the time of hearing; that he is a permanent resident of the address mentioned above with no likelihood of absconding; and that he undertakes not to induce, threaten, or influence any witness or tamper with evidence and is ready to abide by all such terms and conditions as may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court while granting bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application of the applicant.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused all of the documents available on record.
6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the allegations levelled against the applicant, and the fact that the charge-sheet has already been filed, and further considering that a similarly situated co-accused, namely Devansh Dhruw Malkan, has been granted bail by this Court in MCRC No. 9659 of 2025 vide order dated 28.01.2026, and that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 27.03.2025, this Court is of the considered view that, on the ground of parity, the present applicant also deserves to be released on bail.



2026:CGHC:10070

7. Let applicant, **Prahlad Deep**, involved in Crime No.79/2025, registered at Police Station - Cyber Range, Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 111, 3(5), of the 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.

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

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice