



2026:CGHC:22671



2026:CGHC:22671

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 3440 of 2026**

Sudesh Yadav S/o Bhuneshwar Yadav Aged About 30 Years R/o Village Bachwar, P.S. Shankargarh, Distt. Balrampur Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh. (Address Of Applicant Is Wrongly Mentioned As P.S. Shankargarh, R/o Distt. Balrampur Ramanujganj) In The Bail Rejection Order Of The Hon'ble Court)

... Applicant**versus**

State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, P.S. Kusmi, District- Balrampur Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh.

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Sangeet Kumar Kushwaha, Advocate
 For Non-Applicant/State : Mr. Nitansh Kumar Jaiswal, Deputy G.A.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****13.05.2026**

1. This is the **Third Bail Application** filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 39/2025 registered at Police Station – Kusmi, District- Balrampur Ramanujganj (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.
2. The earlier bail applications of the applicant being MCRC Nos. 1812/2026 and 8686/2025 were rejected by this Court vide orders



dated 20.02.2026 and 26.11.2025 respectively on merits with liberty to proceed and conclude the trial expeditiously.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on the basis of Letter No. Establishment/25-26/356 dated 26.05.2025 issued by Arvind Srivastava, Branch Manager, District Cooperative Central Bank Limited, Ambikapur, a report was lodged against accused persons namely Vikash Chand Pandvi, retired Supervisor; Ashok Kumar Soni, Assistant Chief Supervisor; Ethal Singh, retired Committee Manager; Vijay Kumar Uike, retired Branch Manager; Samalsai, retired In-charge Branch Manager; Jagdish Prasad, suspended Assistant Accountant; Tabarak Ali, Sub-Clerk; Laxman Devangan, Institution Manager; Rajendra Prasad Pandey, suspended Co-Chief Supervisor; Sudesh Kumar Yadav, Manager, Jamdi Samiti; Prakash Kumar Singh, Computer Operator, Branch Kusmi; and Rajendra Prasad, suspended Manager, alleging large-scale financial irregularities and misappropriation of bank funds in the Shankargarh and Kusmi branches. It is alleged that pursuant to an e-mail dated 26.04.2024 received from NABARD Regional Office, Raipur, regarding suspicious transactions in Account Nos. 604007085677, 604007009117 and 604007013601, opened under Branches Kusmi and Shankargarh, an inquiry was initiated on the complaint made by the CEO, Janpad Panchayat Shankargarh. During inquiry, a Flash Audit Report was obtained from M/s Naveen Upadhyay & Associates, Chartered Accountants, wherein as on 05.02.2025, irregularities amounting to Rs. 6,27,26,935/- in Account No. 604007085677, Rs. 3,19,20,700/- in Account No.



604007009117, Rs. 2,41,18,614/- in Account No. 604007013601, Rs. 16,58,000/- in Account No. 104003588738, Rs. 64,13,500/- in Account No. 104003641217 and Rs. 46,44,841/- in Account No. 604007024067 were detected, totaling Rs. 13,14,82,590/-. Thereafter, an investigation team was constituted, which reported that an amount of Rs. 19,22,73,908/- was transferred through 1597 financial transactions in Account No. 604007085677, Rs. 91,57,000/- through 46 financial transactions in Account No. 104003641217, Rs. 3,19,20,700/- through 138 financial transactions in Account No. 604007009117 and Rs. 40,54,000/- through 12 NEFT transactions by one Jamuna Anlakar, thereby revealing total financial irregularities of Rs. 23,74,05,608/- in the Shankargarh/Kusmi branches. It is further alleged that an amount of Rs. 96,36,814/- was found credited in Account No. 10400578368 belonging to the present applicant, and thus all the accused persons, in furtherance of criminal conspiracy, committed embezzlement and misappropriation of the bank funds.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the earlier bail applications of the applicant was rejected by this Court on merit with a direction to conclude the trial expeditiously and the applicant is in jail since 27.05.2025 and charge-sheet has been submitted before the competent Court. He further submits that the present third bail application has been filed mainly on medical grounds for proper and better treatment of the applicant, who is suffering from kidney stones in both kidneys along with other multiple ailments. He submits that earlier, on 18.09.2025, the applicant was admitted to



the hospital from judicial custody for treatment and diagnostic purposes, and the relevant medical documents have been filed along with the application as **Annexure A/4**. It is also submitted that in the month of March, 2026, the applicant was again admitted to District Hospital, Balrampur for treatment, and the relevant medical documents relating to such treatment have been annexed as **Annexure A/5**. He further submits that proper treatment facilities relating to kidney ailments are not available at District Hospital, Balrampur and the applicant requires specialized treatment, care, caution and adequate rest. It is also argued that the prosecution has cited as many as 101 witnesses and filed 105 documents, however, till date charges have not yet been framed by the trial Court and, therefore, conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. Hence, it is prayed that the applicant be enlarged on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application of the present applicant.
6. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that this is the third bail application and the earlier bail applications of the applicant were rejected on merits with a direction to conclude the trial expeditiously and further considering that the period of detention, the medical condition of the applicant, and the material available on record, particularly the



medical documents indicating that the applicant is suffering from kidney stones in both kidneys along with other ailments and has remained admitted in hospital on earlier occasions for treatment while in judicial custody, coupled with the fact that adequate specialized treatment facilities are stated to be unavailable at District Hospital, Balrampur. Further considering that the prosecution has cited as many as 101 witnesses and 105 documents and even the charges have not yet been framed, due to which conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail on medical grounds.

8. Accordingly, the third bail application of the applicant is **allowed**. Let the Applicant – **Sudesh Yadav**, involved in Crime No. 39/2025 registered at Police Station – Kusmi, District- Balrampur Ramanujganj (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, be released on bail on furnishing **personal bond** with **two 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 her 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 concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice