



2026:CGHC:27265

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 3672 of 2026**

Dilip Yadav Son Of Shri Shankar Yadav Aged About 45 Years Resident
Of Village Arijam Kalan Police Station Kotwali, Ambikapur District-
Sarguja (C.G.) (Description Mentioned As Per Charge Sheet)

... Applicant**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Office, Police Of
Police Station Lundra, District Sarguja (C.G.)

... Respondent

For Applicant	: Shri Praveen Dhurandhar, Advocate.
For	: Ms. Anusha Naik, Dy.G.A.
Respondent/State	

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****02/07/2026**

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.14/2026 registered at Police Station Lundra, District Sarguja (C.G.)
for the offence punishable under Sections 316(5), 61(2), 238 & 3(5) of

Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the complainant, S.B. Kamte, lodged a written report with the police on 18.01.2026, stating that during the physical verification of Paddy Procurement Centre, Kundikala, a shortage of 888.40 quintals of paddy was found. It is alleged that the present applicant, who was the Manager of the procurement centre, co-accused Govind Prasad Bahra, the Data Entry Operator, and co-accused Saumitra Goyal, the Rice Miller, were responsible for the shortage of paddy. On the basis of the said report, an FIR was registered and, after investigation, a charge-sheet was filed before the competent Court.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is argued that the applicant has neither committed nor participated in the alleged offence and that the material collected during investigation does not disclose a prima facie case against him. It is further submitted that the applicant, who was working as the Manager of the Paddy Procurement Centre, has no criminal antecedents and that the alleged shortage of paddy is based on improper physical verification and mere presumptions. Learned counsel further submits that the co-accused Saumitra Goyal has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 23.03.2026 passed in MCRCA No.435/2026. It is also submitted that the applicant is in custody since 19.02.2026, the charge-sheet has already been filed, the trial is likely to take considerable time, and therefore he deserves to be released on bail.
4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel opposes the bail application

but do not dispute the fact that co-accused person has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court.

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, submission of learned counsel for the parties, materials available on record, nature of allegation levelled against the applicant, further the fact that co-accused Saumitra Goyal has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 23.03.2026 passed in MCRCA No.435/2026, period of detention of the applicant since 19/02/2026, charge sheet has been filed and also considering the fact that trial is likely to take some time for its conclusion, therefore this Court is of the view that the applicant is entitled to be released on bail in this case.
7. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed and it is directed that the Applicant- **Dilip Yadav**, involved in Crime No.14/2026 registered at Police Station Lundra, District Sarguja (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 316(5), 61(2), 238 & 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 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) 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 send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court for necessary information and compliance.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE