



2026:CGHC:21437



2026:CGHC:21437

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 690 of 2026

Bhuneshwar Sahu S/o Late Ganeshram Sahu Aged About 38 Years R/o Arang (Akoli Road Atal Bihar Colony,) P.S. Arang District- Raipur (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through S.H.O. Police Station Kasdol District- Balodabazar- Bhatapara (C.G.)

... Non-applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Om. P. Sahu, Advocate

For Non-applicant/State : Dr. Sourabh Kumar Pandey, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

07/05/2026

1. This first anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed by the applicant, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.433/2025 registered at Police Station – Kasdol District Balodabazar- Bhatapara (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 318 (4), 316 (5), 318 (3), 3(5), 111 of BNS.



2. That, as per the prosecution story, it is alleged that on 25.08.2023, the complainant Chhedilal Sahu visited the house of the applicants to meet Ramnarayan Sahu and his son Gulshan Sahu. During the said meeting, the complainant was induced and allured by the applicants to invest money in share trading with an assurance that the invested amount would be doubled. Relying upon such inducement, the complainant initially invested an amount of Rs. 20,00,000/- through RTGS and thereafter paid remaining amount in cash, thereby investing a total sum of Rs. 39,10,000/- with the assurance of doubling the same within a period of two years. However, the applicants failed to return the said amount despite repeated demands, thereby allegedly committing cheating with the complainant. Consequently, the present offence has been registered against the applicants.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the co-accused persons in the same case have already been granted bail by this Hon'ble Court vide orders dated **01.04.2026** passed in **MCRCA No. 452/2026**, vide order dated **19.03.2026** in **MCRCA No. 420/2026**, vide order dated **02.02.2026** in **MCRCA No. 159/2026**, vider order dated



13.01.2026 in **MCRCA No. 58/2026**, and vide order dated

02.01.2025 in **MCRCA No. 8987/2024**. The case of the present applicant stands on identical footing with that of the co-accused persons, and therefore, he is entitled to the benefit of parity. The investigation has been completed and charge-sheet has already been filed, hence no custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. Therefore, considering the parity and the stage of the case, the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail.

4. Per, contra, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the benefit of parity cannot be claimed mechanically as the role of each accused is distinct and requires individual consideration. It is submitted that the allegations against the present applicant are serious in nature involving cheating of a substantial amount and inducement of investment on false assurances. Merely because charge-sheet has been filed does not dilute the gravity of the offence or entitle the applicant to bail as a matter of right. The possibility of misuse of liberty and affecting the trial proceedings cannot be ruled out at this stage. Hence, it is prayed that the bail application be rejected.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials available on record.



6. Considering the rival submissions of learned counsel for the parties, the nature of allegations, material available on record and the fact that the complainant allegedly invested a substantial amount of Rs. **39,10,000/-** on the inducement of the accused persons for doubling the same through share trading, it appears that the dispute essentially arises out of financial transactions between the parties. It is also not in dispute that the co-accused persons in the present case have already been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated **01.04.2026** in **MCRCA No. 452/2026, 19.03.2026** in **MCRCA No. 420/2026, 02.02.2026** in **MCRCA No. 159/2026, 13.01.2026** in **MCRCA No. 58/2026 and 02.01.2025** in **MCRCA No. 8987/2024**, and the case of the present applicant stands on identical footing. The investigation has been completed and charge-sheet has already been filed, therefore custodial interrogation of the applicant is not required. There is also no material to indicate that the applicant would abscond or tamper with the evidence if released on bail. In view of the principle of parity and considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to allow the application.
7. Accordingly, the instant MCRCA is **allowed** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant – **Bhuneshwar Sahu**, on



executing a personal bond and one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the arresting Officer, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

- (a) The applicant 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 from disclosing such fact to the Court.
- (b) The applicant shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.
- (c) The applicant shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.
- (d) The applicant and the surety shall submit a copy of their adhaar card along with a coloured postcard full size photo having printed the adhaar number on it, which shall be verified by the trial Court.
- (e) The applicant shall not involve himself in any offence of similar nature in future.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice