



2026:CGHC:24764

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****M.Cr.C(A) No.833 of 2026**

Kamlesh Sao, S/o- Shri Bhagat Ram Sao, Aged About 37 Years
R/o- A-1602, 24 K, Soreno Baner, Pune, M. H. **... Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through S H O P/s Vidhan Sabha, Raipur,
C.G. **... Non-applicant**

For Applicant : Mr. Vinay Nagdev, Advocate
through Video Conferencing.

For Non-applicant/State : Mr. Nishant Jaiswal, Dy. G.A.

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

18.06.2026

1. This anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed by the Applicant who is apprehending his arrest in connection



with Crime No.121/2026 registered at Police Station – Vidhansabha, Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 316(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023.

2. As per the brief prosecution case, a written complaint was lodged on 06.04.2026 by Balram Singh Kshatri, Deputy General Manager of Mosh Varya Infrastructure Limited, alleging that one Manish Vishwas, while working as Senior Manager (HR) in the company, had prepared forged salary records in the names of former employees and thereby embezzled an amount of approximately Rs.3,38,34,846/- over a period of five years. During the internal inquiry, it was allegedly found that the misappropriated amounts were transferred to the bank accounts of the family members and associates of the said accused. On the basis of the said allegations, crime was registered and it surfaced that co-accused Monika Sahu, who is the sister of the present Applicant, had allegedly received certain amounts from the main accused. The present Applicant came under the scanner of the investigation on account of monetary transactions between him and his sister, which, according to him, were in the nature of a personal loan transaction and accordingly, the present Applicant has been implicated in the alleged commission of the offence. Hence, this application.



3. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the Applicant has not been named in the FIR and there is no allegation that any amount was transferred to his account from the account of the complainant company. He further submits that the only basis for Applicant's implication is that co-accused Monika Sahu, who is his real sister, allegedly received certain amounts from the main accused and the transactions between the Applicant and his sister were purely personal in nature, arising out of a loan transaction which was subsequently repaid through banking channels. It is further submitted that similarly placed co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders dated 13.05.2026 passed in M.Cr.C.(A) Nos.742/2026 and 745/2026 and, therefore, he may be granted the benefit of anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the Applicants and does not dispute the fact that co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail.
5. Considering the facts and material available in the case diary and the submissions advanced by learned Counsel for the parties, this Court finds that the present Applicant has not been named in the written complaint and there is no



allegation that any amount was directly transferred to his account from the account of the complainant company. The material collected during investigation *prima facie* indicates that the Applicant came under the scanner on account of monetary transactions with his sister, co-accused Monika Sahu, who is alleged to have received certain amounts from the main accused. At this stage, the Applicant's contention that such transactions were in the nature of personal loan transactions cannot be brushed aside. It is also noteworthy that similarly placed co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders dated 13.05.2026 passed in M.Cr.C.(A) Nos.742/2026 and 745/2026. Further, considering the nature of allegations and the fact that custodial interrogation of the Applicant does not appear necessary at this stage, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the Applicant is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the instant MCRCA is **allowed** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the Applicant – **Kamlesh Sao**, on executing a personal bond with one local 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/s shall not directly or indirectly



2026:CGHC:24764

make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her/them from disclosing such fact to the Court.

(b) The Applicant/s shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.

(c) The Applicant/s shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him/her/them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

(d) The Applicant/s and the surety shall submit a copy of his/her/their adhaar card along with a colored postcard full size photo having printed the adhaar number on it, which shall be verified by the trial Court.

(e) The Applicant/s shall not involve himself/herself/themselves in any offence of similar nature in future.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Priya