



2026:CGHC:24104

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 3519 of 2026

Parmeshwar Patle S/o Late Dashrath Patle Aged About 36 Years R/o Vill. Nariyara, P.S. Mulmula, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh.

... **Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer P.S. Akaltara, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh.

... **Non-applicant**

For Applicant	: Mr. Aishwarya Kumar Dubey Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	: Mr. S.S. Baghel, Government Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

16.06.2026

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. 209/2023, registered at Police Station - Akaltara, District - Janjgir Champa (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 201, 120-B of the IPC.
2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the complainant filed and

FIR against unknown persons that a fake account has been created and some amount of his land compensation has been misappropriated after which the police conducted its investigation and found the applicant along with the co-accused person created a fake bank account through accused Shankarlal Bharadwaj with the ID and signatures of other co-accused namely Deepak Diwakar and co-accused Naresh Ratnakar to misappropriate the compensation amount of the complainant amounting to 6,00,000/-, the police traced these two co-accused persons on 08.01.2026 police called accused persons and prepared their memorandum statements wherein the present applicant's name has been surfaced as the main accused persons. It is also alleged that the misappropriate amount of 6,00,000/- has been spent by the accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the present applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. The prosecution has failed to collect any direct, cogent or legally admissible evidence connecting the applicant with the alleged withdrawal of the compensation amount. There is no independent recovery from the applicant, no bank document bearing his signatures, no CCTV footage, no forensic linkage, and no direct money trail showing his involvement in the alleged offence. The prosecution case against the applicant is based primarily on the memorandum statement of a co-accused, which at the highest may give rise to suspicion; however, suspicion, howsoever grave, cannot take the place of legal proof. There is no documentary evidence to establish that the applicant opened any forged bank account, submitted any forged Aadhaar card,

signed any withdrawal instrument, personally withdrew any amount, or received any part of the alleged amount of Rs.6,00,000/-. The FIR itself was lodged on 08.04.2023 in relation to an alleged occurrence of the year 2021, after an unexplained delay of nearly two years, which substantially affects the credibility of the prosecution case. The investigation has already been completed and the charge-sheet has been filed; therefore, no further custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. The case is based predominantly on documentary evidence and involves examination of bank officials, investigating officers, handwriting/document experts and several witnesses, due to which the trial is likely to take considerable time. The applicant has remained in judicial custody since 15.11.2025, therefore he prays for grant of regular bail.

4. On the other hand learned State counsel opposes the bail application of the present applicant and submits that the charge-sheet has been filed in the present case.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case-diary.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the offence levelled against the present applicant, as well as the fact that the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court, and that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 08.01.2026, and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some more time, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant is entitled to be released on bail in the present case.
7. Let applicant, **Parmeshwar Patle**, involved in Crime No. 209/2023,

registered at Police Station - Akaltara, District - Janjgir Champa (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 201, 120-B of the IPC, be released on bail on furnishing **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.

8. Office is directed to provide a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

