



2026:CGHC:23074

NAFR

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

### MCRC No. 3091 of 2026

1 - Suresh Gupta S/o Late K.C. Gupta Aged About 45 Years R/o Near Chandi Temple, Durg, District Durg Chhattisgarh

--- applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Kotwali, District Durg Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent(s)

---

For applicant : Mr. B. P. Singh, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Ghanshyam Kashyap, Dy. G.A. along with Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, Panel Lawyer

---

### MCRC No. 3978 of 2026

1 - Khemraj Deshmukh S/o- Late Baldev Ram Deshmukh Aged About 55 Years R/o- Risali, Near Gayatri Mandir, Newai, Police Station Newai, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh (Correct Particulars Of Applicant No. 1 Are Mentioned Herein Above As The Name Of The Applicant No.1 And His Father's Name Are Wrongly Mentioned As Babloo Verma S/o- Late Baldev Verma In The Impugned Order)

2 - Basant Kumar Soni S/o Late Gopal Soni, Aged About 38 Years R/o- Ram Nagar, Urla, Tehsil Durg, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh

**3** - Shankar Lal Chaudhary S/o Late Ram Nath Choudhary, Aged About 44 Years R/o- Azad Chowk, Kasaridih, Durg, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh (Complete Name Of Applicant No.03 Is Mentioned )

--- applicants

**Versus**

**1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The Station House Officer, Police Station City Kotwali, Durg, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent(s)

---

|                   |   |                                                                                  |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For applicant     | : | Mr. Mahendra Dubey, Advocate                                                     |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Mr. Ghanshyam Kashyap, Dy. G.A. along with<br>Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, Panel Lawyer |

---

**MCRC No. 3689 of 2026**

**1** - Manoj Rajput S/o Dheeraj Singh Aged About 32 Years R/o Village- Kotni, Police Station Pulgaon, Durg Distt.- Durg (C.G.)

--- applicant

**Versus**

**1** - The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Sho, Thana- City Kotwali, Distt.- Durg (C.G.)

--- Respondent(s)

---

|                   |   |                                                                                  |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For applicant     | : | Mr. Sameer Singh, advocate                                                       |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Mr. Ghanshyam Kashyap, Dy. G.A. along with<br>Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, Panel Lawyer |

---

**MCRC No. 3404 of 2026**

**1** - Pankaj Soni S/o Manoj Kumar Soni Aged About 33 Years R/o House No. 179, Near Soni Bhawan, Nayapara, Ward No. 01, Durg, Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh.

--- applicant

**Versus**

1 - The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Sho, Thana City Kotwali, Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)

---

|                   |   |                                                                                  |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For applicant     | : | Mr. Sameer Singh, Advocate                                                       |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Mr. Ghanshyam Kashyap, Dy. G.A. along with<br>Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, Panel Lawyer |

---

**MCRC No. 4446 of 2026**

1 - Lalit Bhatt S/o Late Toran Bhatt, Aged About 30 Years R/o Shiv Nagar, Ward No. 02, Durg , District- Durg (C.G.)

---applicant

**Versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Of Police Station Kotwali Durg , District- Durg (C.G.)

--- Respondent(s)

---

|                   |   |                                                               |
|-------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| For applicant     | : | Mr. Jitendra Gupta, Advocate along with Mr. Devendra Swarnkar |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Mr. Rohan Shukla, Panel Lawyer                                |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, J**

**Order on Board**

**14.05.2026**

1. MCRC No. 3978/2026:- At the outset, learned counsel appearing for applicant would submit that he is not pressing the present bail application on behalf of the applicant No. 1 Khemraj Deshmukh as his name is inadvertently incorrectly mentioned in the impugned order of learned trial Court as well as in the present bail application and he may be given liberty to repeat his bail application after availing

opportunity of bail moved before the learned trial Court with his correct name and correct particulars.

The submissions made by learned counsel for the applicant is not opposed and therefore, the bail application on behalf of the applicant no. 1 Khemraj Deshmukh is dismissed as withdrawn. However, the bail application is to be considered on merits for applicant no. 2 Basant Kumar Soni and applicant No. 3 Shankar Lal Chaudhary.

2. All these applications are arising out of the same crime number and same incident, therefore, they are being heard and decided together.
3. All these are the first bail application of the applicants. The applicants who are arrested on 16.03.2026, are claiming regular bail and they have been arrested in Crime No. 132/2026, registered at P.S. City Kotwali, Durg, for the offence under Section 112 (2) of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 and Section 3 (2) of Chhattisgarh Gambling Prohibition Act, 2022.
4. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.03.2026, the City Kotwali Police, Durg has received secret information that the accused persons are engaged in playing card gambling in the field at Mohlaing Khar, Panchsheel Nagar, Durg. The Police team conducted raid and found 16 persons involved in playing card gambling, however, two accused persons were succeeded to flee from the place and 14 were arrested by the Police. The FIR has been registered and after investigation, charge-sheet has been filed.
5. Mr. B. P. Singh, learned counsel appearing for applicant Suresh Gupta would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the offence. He is only a by passer of the place where the

persons were gathered and enjoying the card, however, there is no gambling through the card which the Police alleged. The offence is triable by Judicial Magistrate, First Class, investigation has been completed and charge-sheet has been filed and no custodial interrogation is required, the final adjudication of the case will take its own time, therefore, he may be enlarged on bail.

6. Mr. Sameer Singh, learned counsel appearing for applicant Pankaj Soni and Manoj Rajput would submit that the place of incident is a field and they were working in the field when the Police called them, on suspicion, they too have been involved in the present incident. He would also submit that there is no criminal antecedent against the applicant Manoj Rajput and only one criminal antecedent against the applicant Pankaj Soni and the applicants are simple villagers who have been falsely implicated in the offence. He too have been submitted that charge-sheet has been filed and final adjudication of the case will take its own time, therefore, they may be enlarged on bail.
7. Mr. Mahendra Dubey, learned counsel appearing for applicants Basant Kumar Soni and Shankar Lal Chaudhary would also submit that present is a case where the Police has arrested the accused persons on apprehension that they have also engaged in card gambling. The Police was engaged in extorting money from the present applicants as they are having past criminal antecedents and when the applicants refused to give them money, they have been falsely implicated them in the present case. In fact, they have no nexus with the present incident, which is allegedly committed by the accused persons, the offence is

triable by Judicial Magistrate First Class and final adjudication of the case will take its own time, therefore, they may be enlarged on bail.

8. Mr. Jitendra Gupta along with Mr. Devendra Swarnkar, learned counsel appearing for applicant Lalit Bhatt would submit that when the crowd was gathered at the place of alleged incident, he too has gone there in the normal course of his curiosity, however, he too has been made accused in the present offence. He would also submit that the applicant is in jail since 16.03.2026, there is no criminal antecedent of the applicant and final adjudication of the case will take its own time, therefore, he may be enlarged on bail.
9. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State opposes and would submit that there are two criminal antecedent against the applicant Suresh Gupta, 04 criminal antecedent against the applicant Basant Kumar Soni, 02 criminal antecedent against the applicant Shankar Lal Chaudhary. The applicants are found engaged in the playing card gambling and they have been arrested on the spot, therefore, they are not entitled for bail.
10. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the case diary as well as material annexed with the respective bail applications.
11. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, considering the nature of allegation, material collected during the investigation, further considering that the applicants are in jail since 16.03.2026 and that the applicant Manoj Rajpur and Lalit Bhatt are not having any criminal antecedent, the Criminal antecedent against the applicants Suresh Gupta, Pankaj Soni, Basant Kumar Soni, Shankar Lal Chaudhary, though, with respect to same offence under Gambling

Act, however, looking to the nature of offence and allegation, despite having their past criminal antecedents, keeping in view that the applicants are in jail since 16.03.2026 and the offence is triable by Judicial Magistrate First Class and final adjudication of the case will take its own time, I am inclined to release the applicants on bail.

12. Accordingly, all the bail applications Suresh Gupta, Pankaj Soni, Manoj Rajput, Lalit Bhatt, Basant Kumar Soni and Shankar Lal Chaudhary are **allowed**.

13. It is directed that the applicants **Suresh Gupta, Pankaj Soni, Manoj Rajput, Lalit Bhatt, Basant Kumar Soni and Shankar Lal Chaudhary** shall be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- each with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, on following conditions:-

(i) They Shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such fact to the Court.

(ii) They shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.

(iii) They shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the concerned trial Court till disposal of the trial.

14. In view of the above, the bail application of the applicant Khemraj Deshmukh is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

Sd/-  
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)  
**Judge**