



2026:CGHC:15373



2026:CGHC:15373

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 484 of 2026

Sushmita Tandon D/o Shiv Ratan Tandon Aged About 26 Years R/o
Gram Kuthod, Hirmi, Distt.- Balodabazar-Bhatapara, C.G.

... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through - Station House Officer, Police Station-
Civil Lines, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent

For Applicant	: Shri Pragalbha Sharma, Advocate.
For	: Ms. Vaishali Mahilong, Dy.G.A.
Respondent/State	

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order On Board

02/04/2026

- The applicant has preferred this application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), for grant of anticipatory bail, apprehending her arrest in connection with Crime No.93/2026, registered at Police Station



Civil Lines, Distt. Raipur (C.G.) for alleged commission of offence punishable under Section 420 R/w 34 of I.P.C. 1860.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that in Crime No. 93/2026 registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Raipur, for offences under Sections 420 and 34 IPC, the accused persons, including the present applicant Sushmita Tandon, in furtherance of their common intention, induced the complainant on the false pretext of securing employment as a Data Entry Operator in the Electricity Department and dishonestly obtained a total amount of Rs.3,00,000/-. It is alleged that out of the said amount, Rs.85,000/- was transferred into the bank account of the applicant through her associate, and thereafter the amount was further transferred to other co-accused persons through online transactions. The accused persons failed to provide the promised job and continued to give false assurances, thereby cheating the complainant, and the financial transactions reflected in the case diary prima facie indicate the involvement of the applicant in the alleged offence. Hence the FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated by the complainant and the entire prosecution case against the applicant is based only on alleged bank transactions. He would submit that no incriminating material or recovery has been made from the possession of the applicant, nor is it shown that the applicant derived any wrongful



gain. He would submit that the case is primarily based on documentary evidence (bank transactions), which are already in possession of the prosecution; hence, custodial interrogation of the applicant is not required. He would submit that the applicant is a woman, and as per settled principles, a liberal approach is to be adopted while considering bail. He would further submit that the applicant is a permanent resident of address mentioned in the cause title and there is no likelihood of absconding, the applicant undertakes to abide by any conditions imposed by this Court, therefore, he submits that the present applicant is entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail. She would further submit that anticipatory bail application of the co-accused Nitin Arun Jadhav has been rejected by this Court vide MCRCA No.396 of 2026 on 16.03.2026, therefore the applicant is also not entitled for grant of anticipatory bail.
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 nature of allegation against the applicant, further the fact that anticipatory bail application of the co-accused Nitin Arun Jadhav has been rejected by this Court vide MCRCA No.396



of 2026 on 16.03.2026 and also considering the fact that investigation is still going on, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant - **Sushmita Tandon**, involved in Crime No.93/2026, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Distt. Raipur (C.G.) for alleged commission of offence punishable under Section 420 R/w 34 of I.P.C. 1860 is **rejected**.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice