



2026:CGHC:13188



2026:CGHC:13188

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 2574 of 2026**

Santosh Kumar Patel @ Santosh Patel S/o Ravinath Patel Aged About 29 Years R/o Village Padkhudi 586, P.S. Churhat, District Sidhi Madhya Pradesh

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

State Of Chhattisgarh Through S.H.O. P.S. Kusmi, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant(s) : Mr. Pushkar Sinha, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Ms. Vaishali Mahilang, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****19.03.2026**

1. The applicant has preferred this First Bail Application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 92/2025, registered at Police Station



Kusmi, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (CG) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 319(2), 336(3), 340, 238(C) of BNS and Section 66(C) and 66(D) of IT Act.

2. The prosecution story in brief, is that the complainant alleged that between the years 2020 to 2025, the applicant/accused, Santosh Kumar Patel induced her by falsely promising to secure government jobs in the police department for her son and daughter, and thereby dishonestly obtained an amount of approximately Rs. 72,00,000/-. It is further alleged that the said amount was arranged by the complainant through sale of land, bank loan, and borrowings. Upon demanding return of the money, the applicant allegedly threatened the complainant and her family with false implication and dire consequences. On the basis of the complaint, an FIR was registered and, upon completion of investigation, charge-sheet has been filed against the applicant for offences under the relevant provisions of BNS and the IT Act. Hence, the bail application.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that although the applicant had taken certain amounts from the complainant on the pretext of providing employment in the police department, the allegation that he demanded a sum of Rs. 72,00,000/- is false and exaggerated, as in fact only an amount of approximately Rs. 17–18 lakhs was received by the



applicant. The applicant is in jail since 12.11.2025 and the trial is likely to take some time for its conclusion. Therefore, he prays for grant of bail to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the charge-sheet has been filed in the present case before the competent Court. She further submits that the applicant is alleged to have cheated the complainant by falsely promising government jobs to her children and dishonestly obtained an amount of about Rs. 72,00,000/-, along with extending threats upon demand of refund. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled for grant of bail.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the facts & circumstances of the case, nature & gravity of the offence, material available in the case dairy and the fact that the applicant is alleged to have cheated the complainant by falsely promising government jobs in police department to her children and dishonestly obtained an amount of about Rs.72,00,000/-, along with extending threats upon demand of refund and counsel for the applicant has stated at bar that the said allegation is false and exaggerated, as in fact only an amount of approximately Rs. 17–18 lakhs was received by the applicant, but considering the conduct of the applicant that he has taken money for providing employment through illegal mode, without



expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that it is not a fit case to enlarge the applicant on regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the bail application of applicant-**Santosh Kumar Patel @ Santosh Patel**, involved in Crime No. 92/2025, registered at Police Station Kusmi, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (CG) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 319(2), 336(3), 340, 238(C) of BNS and Section 66(C) and 66(D) of IT Act, is **rejected**.
8. Needless to say that the trial Court concerned is at liberty to proceed and concluded the trial expeditiously.
9. 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