



2026:CGHC:12479



2026:CGHC:12479

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 2426 of 2026**

Manoj Shrivastava S/o Daya Shankar Aged About 45 Years R/o House No. 65, Daudpur, Gorakhpur, Police Station Kent, District Gorakhpur (U.P.)

... Applicant(s)**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Kawardha, District Kabirdham (Kawardha) (C.G.) (Wrongly Mentioned In Impugned Order As State Of Chhattisgarh, Through District Magistrate, District Kabirdham (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant(s)

For Applicant	: Mr. Amit Soni, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/State	: Ms. Anusha Naik, Deputy Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****16/03/2026**

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 87/2024 registered at Police Station- Kawardha, District- Kabirdham (Kawardha) (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 420 and 34 of IPC.
2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the complainant, Navin



Jain, lodged a written report before the concerned Police Station stating therein that the present applicant, who is the Managing Director of Kavya Industries, cheated him of Rs. 5,51,000/- on the pretext of appointing him as a Super Distributor in the State of Chhattisgarh for its oil manufacturing company. On the basis of the said allegation, an offence under Section 420 of the IPC was registered against the present applicant vide Crime No. 87/2024 on 07.02.2024. Pursuant to the registration of the FIR, investigation was carried out by the non-applicant and after completion of the investigation, charge sheet for the offence punishable under Section 420 read with Section 34 of the IPC was filed before the competent Court.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case for the offence punishable under Sections 420 and 34 of IPC and there is no iota of evidence available against him. It is further submitted that the applicant is in jail since 23.11.2025 and in the present case the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court, therefore no custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. He further submits that the co-accused persons have already been released on bail by the police authorities on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties. It is also submitted that the dispute between the parties is purely of civil/commercial nature and it has been alleged without any material that the applicant used to roam in other States to cheat innocent persons. He further submits that the applicant has only one previous criminal



antecedent, which has been explained in para 4(a) of the bail application. Since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, he prays that the applicant be enlarged on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel appearing for the State/non-applicant opposes the bail application and submits that the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court and the trial is currently in progress. It is further submitted that the applicant has one criminal antecedent and therefore the present application deserves to be rejected.
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 23.11.2025 and the fact that in the present case, charge-sheet has been filed before the competent Court and the applicant has only one previous criminal antecedent as the same has been explained in para 4(a) of the bail application and no further interrogation is required and the trial is likely to take some time for its conclusion, therefore, without further commenting anything on merits, I am inclined to grant bail to the applicant.
7. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant is **allowed**.
8. Let the applicant – **Manoj Shrivastava**, involved in Crime No. 87/2024 registered at Police Station- Kawardha, District- Kabirdham (Kawardha) (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 420 and 34 of IPC, 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**

Kunal