



2026:CGHC:20709

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRCA No. 666 of 2026**

Lav Kumar Yadav S/o Chhabilal Yadav Aged About 36 Years R/o Village-
Okhar, Police Station- Masturi, District- Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Applicant(s)**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The Station House Officer, Police Station-
Masturi, District- Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- Non-Applicant(s)

For Applicant :Mr. Paras Mani Shriwas, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/State : Mr. Priyank Rathi, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Order on Board**04.05.2026**

1. This first anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the BNSS has been filed by the applicant, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 213/2026 registered at Police Station – Masturi, District- Bilaspur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 316(5) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. As per the prosecution story, in brief, during the session 2025–26, the Paddy Procurement Centre (Dhan Kharidi Kendra) at Gataura purchased paddy from the farmers. However, during the course of



inspection, a shortage of 919.69 quintals of paddy and 9,217 *bardana* (17 new and 9,200 old) was found, resulting in a loss to the Government amounting to ₹28,51,000/-. On the basis of the complaint lodged by the complainant, an offence under Section 316(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 has been registered against the present applicant, who was the then In-charge of the Paddy Procurement Centre, along with three other accused persons, namely, Komal Chandrakar (then Society Manager), Rajendra Rathor (then President) and Huleshwar Dhirahi (then Computer Operator).

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is an innocent and reputed person who has not committed any offence and has been falsely implicated by the prosecution authorities in the present case that no prima facie case is made out against him and he has never been involved in any criminal case prior to this incident. It is further submitted that the applicant was working as In-charge of Paddy Procurement Centre, Gataura, for the session 2025-26 from 19.11.2025 to 15.01.2026 and during his tenure, an inspection was carried out by the competent authorities on 20.12.2025 wherein no irregularities were found. It is further submitted that the applicant was suspended on 15.01.2026 and thereafter a subsequent inspection conducted on 25.01.2026 revealed a shortage of only 8.40 quintals of paddy, (copies of the suspension order and inspection report being collectively filed as Annexure A-4). The major alleged shortage of 919.69 quintals of paddy and 9,217 *bardana*, resulting in a loss of ₹28,51,000/-,



pertains to the period from 19.11.2025 to 30.03.2026, which extends beyond the applicant's tenure and during his period of service no irregularity was ever found by the competent authorities, that the applicant is neither a beneficiary nor has he played any role in the alleged offence and has been falsely implicated to shield the real culprits and being a suspended In-charge, in the event of his arrest, he shall suffer irreparable loss, hence, the applicant deserves to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that considering the nature and gravity of the offence, the material collected during investigation and the role attributed to the applicant, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegations, the material available on record and the fact that no irregularity was found during the tenure of the applicant as per the inspection report dated 20.12.2025, that the alleged major shortage pertains to the period beyond his service and further the applicant is not shown to be a beneficiary and has no criminal antecedents and further the applicant is already suspended from his service, therefore, this Court is of the view that the present applicant is entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.



7. Accordingly, the instant MCRCA is **allowed** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant- **Lav Kumar Yadav**, on executing a personal bond and **one surety** in the like sum to the satisfaction of the arresting Officer, he shall be released on anticipatory bail on the following conditions:-

(a) He shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such fact to the Court or any police officer.

(b) He shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.

(c) He shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

(d) That in case of change of address she will inform new address to investigating agency.

(e) He shall not involve Himself in any offence of similar nature in future.

8. It is made clear that the order granting anticipatory bail to the applicant shall not effect the Departmental Inquiry initiated against the applicant by which he has already been suspended.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice