



2026:CGHC:18811  
NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**MCRC No. 3703 of 2026**

Sachin Jain S/o. Ashok Jain Aged About 49 Years R/o. House No. 135,  
Hanuman Mandir Road, Gudhiyari, Raipur District- Raipur (C.G.)

**--- Applicant**

**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Ganj,  
District- Raipur (C.G.)

**... Respondent**

---

|                      |   |                                     |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| For Applicant        | : | Mr. Amit Soni, Advocate             |
| For Respondent/State | : | Mr. Supriya Upasane, Govt. Advocate |

---



2026:CGHC:18809  
NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**MCRC No. 3314 of 2026**

Deepak Agrawal S/o Govind Prasad Agrawal Aged About 40 Years R/o  
Aasma City Homes F.M. A.J. 213, Sakri, Police Station - Sakri, District-  
Bilaspur (C.G.)

**--- Applicant**

**versus**



State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station, Ganj, Distt.- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent

---

|                      |   |                                     |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| For Applicant        | : | Mr. Pragalbha Sharma, Advocate      |
| For Respondent/State | : | Mr. Supriya Upasane, Govt. Advocate |

---

**MCRC No. 3350 of 2026**

Rakhab Dev Pahuja S/o Late Shri Lalchand Pahuja, Aged About 46 Years  
R/o Sector-07, Bhilai Market Shop No. 62, Civil Center Bhilai, Police Station  
Kotwali , District- Durg (C.G.)

--- Applicant

**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station-Ganj, Distt.- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent

---

|                      |   |                                     |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| For Applicant        | : | Mr. Pragalbha Sharma, Advocate      |
| For Respondent/State | : | Mr. Supriya Upasane, Govt. Advocate |

---

**MCRC No. 3343 of 2026**

Jitendra Kumar Kriplani S/o Ramesh Kumar Kriplani Aged About 34 Years  
R/o I-308, R.D.A. Colony, Mahadev Ghat Road, Raipur, District- Raipur  
(C.G.)

---Applicant

**Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station- Ganj,  
District- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent

---

|                      |   |                                     |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| For Applicant        | : | Mr. Ali Afazaal Mirza, Advocate     |
| For Respondent/State | : | Mr. Supriya Upasane, Govt. Advocate |

---



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

**Order on Board**

**23/04/2026**

1. These are the **first bail applications** of the applicants- Deepak Agrawal (MCRC No. 3314 of 2026), Rakhab Dev Pahuja (MCRC No. 3350 of 2026) and Sachin Jain (MCRC No. 3703 of 2026), who have been arrested on 31.01.2026 in connection with Crime No. 30/2026, registered at police station Ganj, District Raipur for the offence under Sections 112(2) of Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (in short 'BNS') and Section 7 of Chhattisgarh Gambling (Prohibition) Act, 2022.
2. The MCRC No. 6024 of 2026 is the **second bail application** of the applicant Jitendra Kumar Kriplani. The first bail application of the applicant Jitendra Kumar Kriplani was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 09.03.2026, passed in MCRC No. 1989 of 2026 with liberty to repeat the same after filing of the charge sheet, as the charge sheet was not filed on that day. The second bail application of the applicant Jitendra Kumar Kriplani has been admitted by this Court vide order dated 13.04.2026. He is also claiming regular bail, who has been arrested on 31.01.2026, in connection with Crime No. 30/2026, registered at police station Ganj, District Raipur for the offence under Sections 112(2) of Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (in short 'BNS') and Section 7 of Chhattisgarh Gambling (Prohibition) Act, 2022.
3. Since all these four bail applications are arising out of the same crime number, therefore they are being heard and decided together.



4. The case of the prosecution in brief is that, on 31.01.2026, the police of police station Ganj, Raipur while on patrolling received a secret information that near Nagorao gali under bridge, some persons are engaged in playing cricket gambling through online mode by their mobile phones and they are in car No. CG 04 NV 6677 and CG 04 PX 6086. When the police conducted search, they found 3-3 persons in each cars and they disclosed their names. From the possession of the accused persons, huge cash amount have been seized. Their memorandum statements have been recorded, in which they disclosed their involvement in online gambling through Master-ID of jmdbet777.com and classic777.com. Their mobile phones have also been seized, the offence have been registered and they were sent to jail.
5. Mr. Pragalbha Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the applicants Deepak Agrawal and Rakhab Dev Pahuja would submit that there is no legally admissible evidence against the applicants that they are involved in the offence of online gambling. Except from the seizure of cash and mobile phones, no any incriminating articles have been found from their possession. Even from the analysis of mobile phone, there is no incriminating material could be extracted, so that they can be connected with the alleged offence. The prosecution case is based on hypothesis that the applicants are involved in playing online gambling. The applicants are businessmen at Raipur and the possession of cash amount with them is in their normal course of business and the same cannot be connected with the offence. He would further submit that the co-accused Piyush Jain and Kamal



Radhwani have been released on bail by the learned trial Court and the case of the present applicants are also similar to them, therefore, they also entitled for parity. The trial of the case will take its own time, therefore, they may be enlarged on bail.

6. Mr. Amit Soni, learned counsel appearing for the applicant- Sachin Jain would submit that the recovery of cash amount and mobile phone, itself are not sufficient to presume that the applicant is involved in online gambling. There is no independent and legally admissible evidence collected by the prosecution to connect the applicant with the offence in question. From the mobile phone, there is no incriminating data collected by the prosecution, so that his involvement in the offence along with the other co-accused persons could be substantiated. The investigation has been completed and charge sheet has been filed and no custodial interrogation is required. The applicant is in jail since 31.01.2026, two co-accused persons Piyush Jain and Kamal Radhwani have already been released on bail by the learned trial Court. Therefore the present applicant may also be released on bail.
7. Mr. Ali Afazal Mirza, learned counsel for the applicant- Jitendra Kumar Kriplani adopting the submissions made by learned counsel for the other applicants would submit that from the mobile phone of the applicant, no online gaming apps could be recovered and there is no banking transaction annexed with the charge sheet, The electronic record is not sufficient to implicate the applicant with the offence in question. He would further submit that the mobile call details and their location are also inconsistent with the allegation of presence of



the applicant on the spot along with the other accused persons. In absence of any sufficient material against the applicant, his involvement in the offence in question cannot be sustained. The applicant has made his application on 06.02.2026 before the competent authority to keep the CCTV footage of the Ganj police station safe, which may be the evidence of false implication of the applicant. He would also submit that the investigation has been completed and charge sheet has been filed, the conclusion of the trial will take its own time, therefore, he may also be enlarged on bail.

8. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the respective applicants, and has submitted that when the police conducted raid at the informed place, they found the accused persons actively involved in playing online gambling through their mobile phone. From the possession of the applicant Deepak Agrawal Rs. 4,50,000/- cash and two mobile phones, from the accused Rakhab Dev Pahuja, Rs. 4,50,000/- cash and two mobile phones, from the applicant Jitendra Kumar Kriplani, Rs. 7,50,000/- cash, one mobile phone and one car and from the applicant Sachin Jain, Rs. 6,00,000/- cash and one mobile phone have been seized. From their mobile phone, they were chatting for online gambling and from their mobile chat, their involvement in the offence in question and chatting with respect to online gambling clearly reflected. They were arrested on the spot. There are criminal antecedents against all the present applicants and therefore, their bail applications have been rejected by the learned trial Court while granting the bail to 02 other co-accused persons



namely Piyush Jain and Kamal Radhwani, who were not having any criminal antecedents and therefore their case is distinguishable. The evidence with relates to their mobile chats extracted from the mobile phones of the applicants are available in the charge sheet. Having such a huge cash amount with them, they found together in two cars and from their mobile phones chatting with respect to online gambling extracted by the police and their criminal antecedents clearly implicate the applicants with the offence in question. Therefore, they are not entitled for bail.

9. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
10. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respective parties, the nature of the allegation and material collected during the investigation, further considering that the huge cash amount have been seized from the present applicants, who were found together in two cars at the same place, their mobile phones bears with the chatting of online gambling, the criminal antecedents of the applicant **Deepak Agrawal** (Crime No. 32/2001 for the offence under Section 3 of Public Gambling Act, 1867), **Sachin Jain** (Crime No. 322/2021, registered at police station Kharora for the offence under Section 3 of Public Gambling Act, Crime No. 173/2016, registered at police station Azad Chow, Raipur for the offence under Section 3 of Public Gambling Act, 1867, Crime No. 119/2022, registered at police station Saraswati Nagar, Raipur for the offence under Section 3 of Public Gambling Act, 1867 and Crime No. 198/2017, registered at police station Gudhiyari, Raipur for the



offence under Section 3 of Public Gambling Act, 1867), **Jitendra Kriplani** (Crime No. 91/2022, registered at police station Gudhiyari, Raipur for the offence under Section 3 of Public Gambling Act, 1867, Crime No. 241/2025, registered at police station Gunderdehi, District Balod for the offence under Section 3(2) of Chhattisgarh Gambling (Prohibition) Act, 2022, Crime No. 231/2020, registered at police station Azad Chowk, Raipur for the offence under Section 3 of Public Gambling Act, 1867 and the applicant **Rakhab Dev Pahuja** (Crime No. 96 of 2018, registered at police station Utai, District Durg for the offence under Section 3 of Public Gambling Act, 1867, I am not inclined to release these applicants on bail. Online gambling is an organized crime having various facets and impact upon the economy of the country. In view of the gravity of the offence and the manner, in which the applicants involved in the alleged offence, they are not entitled to be released on bail.

11. Accordingly, the first bail applications of the applicants, namely **Deepak Agrawal** (MCRC No. 3314 of 2026), **Rakhab Dev Pahuja** (MCRC No. 3350 of 2026) and **Sachin Jain** (MCRC No. 3703 of 2026) and second bail application of the applicant **Jitendra Kumar Kriplani** (MCRC No. 3343 of 2026) are hereby **rejected**.

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

ved