



2026:CGHC:23891



2026:CGHC:23891

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 3569 of 2026**

Hanumantrav Tandan S/o- Videshiram Tandan Aged About 34 Years
Resident Of Korbi, P.S. And Tehsil Balouda, District- Janjgir-Champa
(C.G.)

... Applicant**versus**

State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station
Sarsiwan District- Sarangarh- Bilaigarh (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Abhishek Banjare, Advocate

For Non-Applicant/State : Mr. Shaleen Singh Baghel, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****15.06.2026**

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 390/2025 registered at Police Station- Sarsiwan, District- Sarangarh-Bilaigarh, (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 336(3), 336(4), 338, 340(2), 341(1), 341(2), and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. The facts of the case, in brief, are that the present case arises out of alleged financial irregularities connected with Crime No.131/2024



registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 409, 120-B and 34 of the IPC and Sections 6 and 10 of the Chhattisgarh Nikshepakon Ke Hiton Ka Sanrakshan Adhiniyam, 2005. As per the prosecution case, an amount of approximately Rs.21,00,000/-, which had been placed under hold in an HDFC Bank account, was subsequently released and withdrawn on the basis of allegedly forged and fabricated documents bearing a fake seal and forged signatures of the Station House Officer, Police Station Sarsiwa. It is alleged that the applicant, while working with HDFC Bank, was involved in the process of removing the hold from the account and facilitating withdrawal of the amount through banking procedures. The prosecution relies upon bank records, forged documents and other material collected during investigation, and further contends that recovery and seizure proceedings are still pending. The applicant has been arrested in connection with the aforesaid offence and is presently in judicial custody. Hence, this bail application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the prosecution case primarily revolves around the preparation and use of allegedly forged documents and fabricated seals/signatures, and there is no specific allegation that the applicant himself forged any document or prepared any fake seal. It is submitted that the applicant was working in the bank and had acted in the course of his official duties under the instructions of his superior officers, his role being purely procedural in nature without any decision-making



authority. He further submits that the entire case rests upon documentary evidence, including bank records and alleged forged documents, all of which have already been seized and are in the possession of the prosecution, therefore, no further custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. It is also submitted that the alleged amount of Rs.21,00,000/- has neither been recovered from the possession of the applicant nor is there any allegation that he derived any pecuniary benefit from the transaction. The applicant is a permanent employee and continued detention would adversely affect his future and cause undue hardship to his family. It is submitted that the case diary itself reflects that the matter pertains to verification of documents, seals, bank records and financial transactions, and therefore continued incarceration of the applicant would serve no useful purpose. He further submits that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedents, the charge-sheet has been filed, he is in jail since 08.02.2026, 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 before the competent Court. He further submits that the applicant was not merely performing a procedural role but was actively involved in facilitating the release and withdrawal of an amount of approximately Rs.21,00,000/- from an account which had been placed under hold in connection with a criminal case. It is submitted that the withdrawal was effected on the basis of forged and



fabricated documents and the material collected during investigation prima facie indicates the applicant's involvement in the alleged conspiracy. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence, the manner in which the offence was committed and the material available on record, it is prayed that the applicant does not deserve the benefit of bail and the application is liable to be rejected.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case that thought the allegations against the applicant are that the applicant was actively involved in facilitating the release and withdrawal of an amount of approximately Rs.21,00,000/- from an account which had been placed under hold in connection with a criminal case, but it is to be noted that the applicant is in jail since 08.02.2026, the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court, he has no previous criminal antecedents, and the trial is likely to take considerable time for its conclusion. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the present applicant is entitled to be released on regular bail in this case.
7. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant is **allowed**. Let the applicant - **Hanumantrav Tandan**, involved in Crime No. 390/2025 registered at Police Station- Sarsiwan, District- Sarangarh-Bilaigarh, (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 336(3), 336(4), 338, 340(2), 341(1), 341(2), and 3(5) of of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, be released on bail on his



furnishing **a 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 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)



2026:CGHC:23891

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**

Rahul Dewangan