



2026:CGHC:24711



2026:CGHC:24711

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 5282 of 2026

Gulshan Kashyap S/o Prem Shankar Aged About 20 Years R/o Daheli,
P.S. Reuna, Distt. Kanpur U.P.

... Applicant

versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Palari, District-
Balodabazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Amit Matre, Advocate

For Non-Applicant/State : Ms. Palak Dwivedi, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

18.06.2026

1. This is the First bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 66/2026 registered at Police Station – Palari, District-Balodabazar-Bhatapara, (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Section 108 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and under Section 66(D) of the Information Technology Act, 2000.
2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that during the inquiry of Marg No. 102/2025 registered under Section 194 BNSS at Police



Station Palari, it was found that an unknown person, using mobile numbers 7309260459, 8924023506 and 7992137231, had contacted the deceased, a 24-year-old woman, and falsely claimed that he had access to her objectionable videos. By threatening to make her photographs public on social media and thereby defame her, the caller allegedly extorted a sum of Rs.60,000/- from her through online transactions. It is further alleged that even after receiving the said amount, the caller continued to harass and intimidate her with repeated demands for more money. Unable to bear the continuous harassment and threats, the deceased allegedly consumed poison on 17.04.2025 and, during treatment, succumbed on 22.04.2025. On the basis of the marg inquiry, Crime No. 66/2026 was registered under Section 108 of the BNS against unknown persons. During investigation, the CDR and other technical details of the aforesaid mobile numbers were obtained, which revealed that an amount of Rs.26,999/- out of the extorted money had been transferred to an Airtel Payments Bank account linked with mobile number 8546031763 belonging to the present applicant. The applicant was thereafter traced in District Kanpur Nagar, Uttar Pradesh, and upon interrogation and memorandum statement, the mobile numbers allegedly used in the commission of the offence along with the amount received were seized from his possession. Thereafter, he was arrested after obtaining transit remand. Investigation further revealed the involvement of two other co-accused persons, who are absconding since the date of the incident. Upon completion of investigation, a charge-sheet has been



filed against the applicant under Section 108 of the BNS and Section 66(D) of the Information Technology Act. Hence, this bail application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that neither the name of the applicant nor his mobile number finds mention in the suicide note and there is no direct allegation against him. He further submits that the actual perpetrators, if any, are different persons and the applicant had neither any role nor any knowledge of the alleged acts attributed to the co-accused persons. It is argued that the applicant has been implicated merely on the basis of suspicion and his memorandum statement, and except for the said memorandum, there is no cogent or incriminating material available in the entire charge-sheet connecting him with the alleged offence. It is further submitted that the ingredients of Section 108 of the BNS are not attracted against the applicant. He also points out that there was delay in lodging the FIR, which casts doubt upon the prosecution story. Since all the material evidence is electronic in nature and secured by the investigating agency, there is no likelihood of tampering with the evidence. It is also submitted that there are 26 witnesses cited in the charge-sheet and no one examined till date. It is also submitted that applicant is in jail since 30.03.2026, the charge-sheet has already been filed, he has no previous criminal antecedents. Looking to the nature of evidence and the fact that the trial is likely to take considerable time for its conclusion, therefore, he prays for



grant of regular bail to the present applicant.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that the charge-sheet has been submitted before the competent Court. He further submits that the applicant is involved in a serious offence wherein a young woman was continuously threatened and blackmailed by unknown persons on the pretext of possessing her objectionable videos and photographs, resulting in extortion of money and ultimately driving her to commit suicide. It is submitted that during investigation, the CDR and technical analysis of the mobile numbers used in the commission of the offence revealed that an amount of Rs.26,999/- out of the extorted amount of Rs.60,000/- was transferred to the Airtel Payments Bank account linked with mobile number 8546031763 belonging to the present applicant. She further submits that the applicant was traced and apprehended from District Kanpur Nagar, Uttar Pradesh, and pursuant to his memorandum statement, the mobile numbers used in the offence as well as the amount received by him were seized. It is further submitted that the investigation has disclosed the involvement of the applicant along with other co-accused persons in a well-planned cyber fraud and extortion racket, and two co-accused persons are still absconding. The prosecution case is also supported by the deceased's dying declaration and other electronic evidence collected during investigation. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the direct monetary trail leading to the applicant's account, the material collected during investigation and the serious



consequences resulting in the death of the victim, she prays that the present applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the material collected during investigation, the dying declaration of the deceased, and the electronic evidence available on record, and the fact that the deceased was allegedly subjected to continuous threats and blackmail by persons claiming to possess her objectionable videos and photographs, and was coerced into transferring an amount of Rs.60,000/-. The investigation further discloses that an amount of Rs.26,999/- out of the extorted money was transferred to the Airtel Payments Bank account linked with mobile number 8546031763 belonging to the present applicant. The applicant was traced and apprehended from District Kanpur Nagar, Uttar Pradesh, and pursuant to his memorandum statement, the mobile numbers allegedly used in the commission of the offence along with the amount received by him were seized. The prosecution material *prima facie* indicates the involvement of the applicant in the alleged cyber extortion scheme, which ultimately resulted in the deceased consuming poison and succumbing during treatment. The investigation has further revealed the involvement of other co-accused persons, two of whom are still absconding. At this stage, the monetary trail connecting the applicant with the crime, the recoveries effected during investigation, the deceased's dying



declaration and other electronic evidence collected by the prosecution cannot be ignored. Considering the serious nature of the allegations, the *prima facie* material available against the applicant, and the fact that the offence has culminated in the death of a young woman, this Court is of the opinion that it is not a fit case to enlarge the applicant on regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant – **Gulshan Kashyap**, involved in Crime No. 66/2026 registered at Police Station – Palari, District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara, (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Section 108 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and under Section 66(D) of the Information Technology Act, 2000, is **rejected**.
8. Needless to say that the trial Court concerned is at liberty to proceed and conclude the trial expeditiously.
9. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Rahul Dewangan