



2026:CGHC:9215



2026:CGHC:9215

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 1830 of 2026**

Yogesh Dewangan S/o Padum Lal Dewangan Aged About 38 Years R/o Charpara Kohadiya, Tahsil and District – Korba, C.G.

... Applicant**versus**

State of Chhattisgarh Through Police Chowki C S E B, Police Station- Civil Line Korba, District – Korba, C.G.

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	: Mr. Vikas Kumar Pandey, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	: Ms. Anusha Naik, Deputy Government Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****23.02.2026**

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. 37/2026, registered at Police Station – Civil Line Korba, District – Korba (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code.
2. The prosecution's case, in brief, is that on 14/01/2026, the complainant, Sunil Kurrey, lodged a written complaint at the Civil Line Police Station, Korba. He alleged that the accused person took money on 04/01/2024, promising to provide a job under compassionate appointment in the



Excise Department, as the complainant's father had passed away in 2009 during his service. Based on this complaint, the police registered an FIR against the accused under Section 420 read with Section 34 of the IPC, and Crime No. 37/2026 was filed at the Civil Line Police Station, Korba, District Korba (C.G.).

3. Learned counsel for the applicant argues that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the complainant is a relative of the co-accused, Motilal Dewangan. The complainant had received Rs. 20,000/- for personal work related to Motilal Dewangan, and later returned the money to the co-accused on 04/01/2024 via PhonePe. However, two years and ten days after the incident, the complainant lodged a false report against the applicant and the other co-accused. The complainant has failed to provide any explanation for the delay in filing the FIR. It is further submitted that the other co-accused, namely, Motilal Madhukar has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 10.02.2026 passed in MCRCA No. 218/2026. He further submits that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedents. The applicant has been in judicial custody since 16.01.2026, and the trial is likely to take a considerable time for its conclusion. Therefore, learned counsel prays for grant of bail to the applicant on the ground of parity.
4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposed the bail application and submitted that the charge-sheet has not been filed in the present.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused 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 co-accused, namely, Motilal Madhukar has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 10.02.2026 passed in MCRCA No. 218/2026, further that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedent, the applicant has been in judicial custody since 16.01.2026, and the trial is likely to take a considerable time for its conclusion, this Court is of the view that the applicant is entitled to be released on bail in this case on the ground of parity.

7. Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**. Let the applicant - **Yogesh Dewangan**, involved in Crime No. 37/2026, registered at Police Station - Civil Line Korba, District - Korba (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond with **two 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.



2026:CGHC:9215

(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**

Preeti