



2026:CGHC:28491



CGHC010165192026



2026:CGHC:28491

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 3855 of 2026

Sanket Shukla S/o Lalit Narayan Aged About 50 Years R/o Ward No. 3, Civil Line, Balodabazar, District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.)

--- **Applicant(s)**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station City Kotwali, District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.)

--- **Respondent(s)**

MCRC No. 3931 of 2026

Sanket Shukla S/o Lalit Narayan Aged About 50 Years R/o Ward No. 3, Civil Line, Balodabazar, District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.)

---**Applicant(s)**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station City Kotwali, District Balodabazar Bhatapara (C.G.)

--- **Respondent(s)**

For Applicant(s) : Mr. A.K.Yadav, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Dr. Saurabh Kumar Pande, Deputy Advocate General

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

09/07/2026

1. Since the applicant in both the above bail applications are same and further the allegations in both these case are similar, they are being heard together.



2. These are the first bail applications filed under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested on 15.04.2026 in connection with Crime No. 261/2024 {in M.Cr.C. No. 3931/2026} and Crime No. 262/2024 {in M.Cr.C.No. 3855/2026} registered at Police Station – City Kotwali, Balodabazar, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara, for the offence punishable under Sections 384, 389, 212, 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code (for short, the IPC).
3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, {in MCrC No. 3855/2026} is that on 30.03.2024, Crime No. 250/2024 was registered at Police Station City Kotwali, Balodabazar, under Section 384, 389 and 34 of the IPC against accused Monty @ Pratyush Maraiya, an unidentified masked woman and other co accused persons, and the matter was taken up for investigation. During the course of investigation, it was revealed that between 15.02.2024 to 20.02.2024, the accused persons demanded money from one Devnarayan Pandey by threatening to falsely implicate him in a sex scandal and has demanded 6,00,000/-. Under such threat and coercion, an amount of Rs. 6,00,000/- was paid to Heeramani and Ravina Tandan. Thus, a total amount of Rs. 6,00,000/- is alleged to have been extorted from the victim by 8 accused persons. Upon the said facts coming to notice, Assistant Sub Inspector registered a separate case bearing Crime No. 262/2024 under Sections 384, 389 and 34 of the IPC against the named accused persons, namely Monty @ Pratyush Maraiya, Durga Tandon, Ravina Tandon, Pushpmala Fekar, Hirakali, Anurita Banjare, Ashish Shukla and Shirish Pandey, and undertook investigation. After completion of investigation, a charge-sheet was prepared wherein the present applicant was cited as Witness No. 3 and his statement was recorded by the Deputy Superintendent of Police



Balodabazar and charge-sheet/challan was filed. After filing the challan the Inspector of Police Station, City Kotwali Balodabazar-Bhatapara again perused the case dairy and statement, wherein it was allegedly revealed that the present applicant, was in close association with Devnarayan Pandey and appears to have acted as a mediator in facilitating payment of the illegally extorted amount to the accused persons. Consequently, a supplementary charge-sheet was filed against the present applicant by the inspector of Police Station, City Kotwali Balodabazar-Bhatapara, for the offences punishable under section 384, 389, 212, 201, 34 of IPC.

4. In MCrC No. 3931/2026, case of the prosecution is that during the course of investigation of Crime No. 250/2024, it was revealed that in between 15.02.2024 to 20.02.2024, the accused persons demanded money from one Amrish Sahu by threatening to falsely implicate him in a sex scandal. Under such threat and coercion, an amount of Rs. 50,000/- and Rs. 25,000/- was paid to Ashish Shukla through Akash Kesarwani at the office of Ashish Shukla situated at Balodabazar. Further, an amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- was paid to Ravina Tandon and Anurita Banjare at Kohraud Road near Lavan Road. Thus, a total amount of Rs. 2,75,000/- is alleged to have been extorted from the victim. Upon the said facts coming to notice, Assistant Sub Inspector Rajendra Patil registered a separate case bearing Crime No. 261/2024 under Sections 384, 389 and 34 of the IPC against the named accused persons, namely Monty @ Pratyush Maraiya, Durga Tandon, Ravina Tandon, Pushpmala Fekar, Hirakali, Anurita Banjare, Ashish Shukla and Shirish Pandey, and undertook investigation. After completion of investigation, a charge-sheet was prepared wherein the present applicant was cited as witness No. 5 and his statement was recorded by the Deputy Superintendent of



Police, Balodabazar and charge-sheet/ challan was filed. After filling the challan, the Inspector of Police Station City Kotwali Balodabazar-Bhatapara again perused the case dairy and statements, and it was allegedly revealed that the present applicant was in close association with Amrish Sahu and appears to have acted as a mediator in facilitating payment of the illegally extorted amount to the accused persons, Consequently, a supplementary charge-sheet was filed against the present applicant by the Inspector of Police Station, City Kotwali Balodabazar-Bhatapara, for the offences punishable under Sections 384, 389, 212, 201, 34 of IPC.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present cases. It is further submitted that the FIR registered on 07.04.2024 against the 8 persons, in the said FIR, there is no allegation against the present applicant and after investigation, the police has filed challan on 25.11.2024 where the applicant is named as prosecution witness No. 3. There is no call detail, call recording between the applicant and the other accused persons, bank transaction, electronic evidence or any witness to show that the applicant either committed or participated in the commission of the alleged offence of extortion of money. No seizure or recovery has been made from him. The investigation in both the cases is complete and charge sheet and supplementary charge sheet has also been filed. Apart from the present two case, the applicant has two other criminal antecedents. In one case, he has been acquitted and in the other, closure report has been filed. It is further submitted that some of the co-accused persons who were named in the FIR have been granted regular bail by this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 08.01.2025 passed in M.Cr.C. No. 7972/2024 and other connected matters and on the ground



of parity, the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel appearing for the respondent/State while opposing the bail applications, submit that the name of the present applicant has come to light in the further investigation conducted by the Police, however, he could not dispute that some of the co-accused persons have been granted bail by this Hon'ble Court.
7. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
8. Taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the offence, period of detention of the applicant and further the fact that investigation has already been concluded and charge sheet/supplementary have also been filed before the trial Court concerned, there is no other criminal case pending against the applicant, further the fact that initially, the applicant was not named in the FIR and that similarly situated co-accused persons have been granted regular bail by this Court and that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, I am inclined to grant bail to the present applicant.
9. Accordingly, both the bail applications of the applicant are **allowed**.
10. Let the applicant – **Sanket Shukla** involved in Crime No. 262/2024 {in M.Cr.C. No.3855/2026} and Crime No. 261/2024 {M.Cr.C.No. 3931/2026} registered at Police Station–City Kotwali, Balodabazar, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara, for the offence punishable under Sections 384, 389, 212, 201 and 34 of the IPC, be released on bail on his furnishing a **personal bond** with **two sureties** {in both cases}, 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.

- 11.** Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE