



2026:CGHC:20707



2026:CGHC:20707

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRCA No. 668 of 2026**

Sakib Kuraishi @ Shanu S/o Mohd. Ahmad Aged About 26 Years
Resident Of Chief House Godaripara, Chirmiri, Police Station And Tahsil
Chirmiri, District Manendragarh-Chirmiri-Bharatpur (C.G.)

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

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Of
Police Station Chirmiri, District Manendragarh-Chirmiri-Bharatpur (C.G.)

---- Non-Applicant(s)

For Applicant

:Mr. Akhtar Hussain, Advocate.

For Non-Applicant/State

:Mr. Ankita Shukla, Panel Lawyer.

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

1. This Second 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. 92/2026 registered at Police Station – Chirmiri, District- Manendragarh-Chirmiri-Bharatpur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 06 of Gambling Act and 112 of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita.



2. The applicant's earlier anticipatory bail application, being MCRCA No. 587/2026, was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 21.04.2026, as the offence was incorrectly mentioned as "06 of Juva Act" instead of Section 6 of the Gambling Act in the entire application. Hence, this anticipatory bail application.
3. Prosecution case, in brief, is that on 22.02.2026 the police of the concerned Police Station received credible information that certain persons were engaged in illegal Satta (gambling) activities, upon which the police party immediately proceeded to the spot and conducted a raid, where several persons were found involved in betting activities and during the course of search, articles related to Satta Patti, including slips and other incriminating materials used for recording bets, were seized and a cash amount was also recovered from the possession of the accused persons and thereafter, the police registered the FIR against the accused persons.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case and has not acted in the manner as alleged by the prosecution and that the applicant has not committed any offence nor taken any amount from the complainant and no seizure has been made from his possession and he was not present at the spot at the relevant time and has been wrongly implicated in the case and further that the co-accused persons have already been granted bail by the learned trial Court vide order dated 20.03.2026 and on the ground of parity the present applicant is also entitled for grant of anticipatory bail and that custodial interrogation of the applicant is neither necessary nor



justified and his arrest would cause irreparable loss to his career and reputation in society and further submits that the earlier anticipatory bail application of the applicant being MCRCA No. 587/2026 was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 21.04.2026 not on merits but on account of a technical defect as the offence was wrongly mentioned as "06 of Juva Act" instead of Section 6 of the Gambling Act in the entire application and the grounds raised by the applicant in the present application clearly make out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel appearing for the non-applicant/State opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that that during the raid conducted at the spot, three accused persons were found involved in illegal gambling activities, however, on seeing the police party, all three fled from the spot, and from the said place, *Satta*-related articles along with a cash amount were seized and further submits that the present applicant has three criminal antecedents, out of which in two cases he has already been acquitted, which have been duly explained, however, one case under the Excise Act is still pending against him and has not been properly explained, therefore, considering the same, the applicant is not entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.



7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offence alleged against the applicant and the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and further taking into account that the earlier anticipatory bail application of the applicant was dismissed as withdrawn not on merits but on account of a technical defect and that no seizure has been made from the present applicant and he was not present at the spot at the relevant time and further considering the fact that co-accused persons have already been granted bail and also considering that two of the criminal antecedents of the applicant have resulted in acquittal and the remaining case is under the Excise Act thus, this Court is of the opinion that the present applicant is entitled to be release on anticipatory bail.
8. Accordingly, the instant MCRCA is **allowed** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant- **Sakib Kuraishi @ Shanu**, 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.



2026:CGHC:20707

(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.

**Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice**

Kunal