



2026:CGHC:12463



2026:CGHC:12463

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 396 of 2026

Nitin Arun Jadhav S/o Arun Jadhav Aged About 32 Years R/o LIG
820 CG Housing Board Colony Sejbahar, Raipur District Raipur
(C.G.) **... Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police
Station Civil Lines, Dist- Raipur (C.G.) **... Non-applicant**

For Applicant :Mr. Shivam Mishra, Advocate.

For Non-applicant/State :Ms. Vaishali Mahilang, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

16.03.2026

1. This anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed by the Applicant, who is apprehending his arrest in connection



with Crime No.93/2026 registered at Police Station –Civil Lines, District Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420/34 IPC.

2. Prosecution case, in brief, is that the accused persons Sushmita Tandon and Shahid Hussain allegedly induced the complainant Roshna Parveen and her friend Amit on the pretext of providing a Government job as a Data Entry Operator in the Electricity Department, Raipur, and obtained Rs.1,50,000/- each from them, totaling Rs.3,00,000/-, through bank transfer and PhonePe. It is further alleged that when the complainants were not selected and demanded the return of their money, the accused persons avoided repayment and referred them to the present Applicant, stating that he was a senior officer, who allegedly assured them of arranging a Government job in future; however, the amount was not returned. Based on these allegations, the aforesaid offence has been registered against the present Applicant. Hence, this application.
3. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that no recovery of any amount was made from the Applicant and he has not assured any of the complainants for providing them jobs and the main allegation



is only against the co-accused who took money from the complainants on the pretext of providing them jobs. He lastly submits that conclusion of trial is likely to take quite some time for its conclusion, therefore, the present Applicant may be granted anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submitted that there is one previous criminal antecedent against the present Applicant of the year 2018 pertaining to the Gambling Act and that there is active participation of the present Applicant in the alleged crime, therefore, he does not deserve to be granted anticipatory bail.
5. Considering the submissions advanced by learned Counsel for the parties, the facts and circumstances of the case and further considering that investigation is still going on and there is one previous criminal antecedent against the Applicant of the year 2018 pertaining to the Gambling Act and he has actively participated in the alleged crime the fact, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the Applicant.
6. Accordingly, the Anticipatory Bail application of the Applicant – **Nitin Arun Jadhav** filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 in connection with Crime No.93/2026 registered at



Police Station –Civil Lines, District Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420/34 IPC, is hereby **rejected**.

7. Office is directed to provide a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Priya