



2026:CGHC:10039



2026:CGHC:10039

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 307 of 2026

Laxmichand Gurwani S/o Bharumal Gurwani Aged About 52 Years R/o
Near Old Arpana Bridge, New Sarkanda, Bilaspur District- Bilaspur
(C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station
Saraswati Nagar, Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent

For Applicant : Smt. Hamida Siddiqui, Advocate.

For : Ms. Vaishali Mahilong, Dy.G.A.

Respondent/State

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

26/02/2026

1. This first anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the
Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed by the
applicant, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with
Crime No.20/2026 registered at Police Station – Saraswati Nagar,



Raipur, District-Raipur (C.G.). for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 61(2) of BNS.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that Crime No. 20 of 2026 has been registered on 16/01/2026 at Police Station Saraswati Nagar, Raipur, for offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338 and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, on the allegation that the accused persons, in connection with a proposed transaction relating to certain immovable property, induced the complainant company to part with substantial amounts of money on the assurance that the said property was free from encumbrances and legally capable of being transferred, and that meetings were held between the complainant (Sambhav Steels Private Limited) and the representatives of the accused company (Hi-tech Abrasives Private Limited), pursuant to which an Agreement to Sale dated 16.12.2025 was executed and payments aggregating to approximately Rs. 11.51 crores were made by the complainant through banking channels. According to the prosecution, it subsequently came to light that the subject property was already mortgaged with financial institutions and was also the subject matter of recovery proceedings before the Debt Recovery Tribunal, which fact was allegedly suppressed from the complainant at the time of negotiations and execution of the documents, and on this basis the prosecution alleges that the accused persons acted in concert with a dishonest intention from the very inception of the transaction, resulting in wrongful loss to



the complainant and corresponding wrongful gain to the accused, leading to registration of the present FIR and initiation of investigation. Hence this anticipatory bail application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the allegations in the FIR are baseless and fabricated to implicate the applicant in a criminal case. She would submit that though the applicant is a signatory authority of the company, he works under the dictate of the board of directors and not on his own discretion. She would submit that the compromise has been arrived at between both the parties, i.e. director of the accused company and the complainant, and his family members have already paid a substantial sum of Rs. 6 crores and undertaken to repay the remaining amount to the complainant. She would submit that co-accused Vinod Bajoria has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in MCRCA No.167/2026 on 03/02/2026 and co-accused Sejal Rathod has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in MCRCA No.239/2026 on 19/02/2026. She would submit that the applicant is permanent resident of address shown in the cause title, there is no chance of his absconding and applicant is ready to furnish adequate surety and shall abide by all the directions and conditions, which may be imposed by this Court, therefore, she submits that the present applicant is entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.



4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, appearing for the non - applicant/State, opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail but do not dispute the fact that co-accused persons have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials available on record.
6. Considering the facts & circumstances of the case, submission of learned counsel for the parties, materials available on record, considering the fact that co-accused Vinod Bajoria has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in MCRCA No.167/2026 on 03/02/2026 and co-accused Sejal Rathod has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in MCRCA No.239/2026 on 19/02/2026 and further considering the fact that compromise has taken place between the parties, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the present applicant.
7. Accordingly, the instant MCRCA is **allowed** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant – **Laxmichand Gurwani**, on executing a personal bond and one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the arresting Officer, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-
 - (a) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to



2026:CGHC:10039

dissuade him from disclosing such fact to the Court.

(b) The applicant shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.

(c) The applicant shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

(d) The applicant and the surety shall submit a copy of his adhaar card along with a coloured postcard full size photo having printed the adhaar number on it, which shall be verified by the trial Court.

(e) The applicant shall not involve himself in any offence of similar nature in future.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice