



2026:CGHC:32716



CGHC010247982026



2026:CGHC:32716

NAFR

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

### MCRC No. 6005 of 2026

Golu Narayan Chakradhari S/o Pawan Chakradhari Aged About 22 Years  
Resident Of Village- Gangouti, Out Post Basdei, Police Station And District-  
Surajpur (C.G.) **... Applicant**

**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Of Police  
Station- Surajpur, District- Surajpur (C.G.) **...Non-applicant**

---

For Applicant : Mr. Dharendra Prasad Mishra, Advocate.

---

For Non-Applicant/State : Mr. S.S. Baghel, Govt. Advocate.

---

**Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**

### Order on Board

**29.07.2026**

1. The applicant has preferred this Second Bail Application under Section 483 of B.N.S.S. for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 378/2025, registered at Police Station : Surajpur District - Surajpur (C.G) for the offence punishable under Sections 317(4), 318(2), 61(2)(A) and Section 66 (D) of the I.T. Act.



2. The earlier bail application of the applicant has been rejected on merits by this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 03.12.2025 passed in MCRC No. 9835 of 2025.
3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the Joint Cyber Crime Coordination Team Management Information System in a portal, it was found that there are different-different Branches of Bank, in which via forged mobile number, the amount was deposited and it was found that joint account was opened by the Golu Narayan Chakradhari, Dev Narayan Chakradhari, Mahesh Kumar Chakradhari and joint account was opened in the name of "Jan Seva Shiksha Ewam Samajik Utthan" as the firm was registered in this regard and the account was opened at IDFC Bank Branch Surajpur, in which the amount of Cyber Fraud was deposited and on being found that the amount was transferred in the account of "Jan Seva Shiksha Ewam Samajik Utthan" was deposited is the amount of cyber fraud, subsequently the matter being investigated by the police and it was found that in the account of "Jan Seva Shiksha Ewam Samajik Utthan" a sum of Rs. 52,57,000/- was deposited and the applicants have been arrested for the commission of alleged offences.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no role in the commission of the alleged offence. It is submitted that the applicant had earlier approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No. 3142 of 2026, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court, while disposing of the petition, granted liberty to renew the prayer for bail before this Court after the expiry of three



months. Pursuant to the said liberty, the present repeat bail application has been filed. It is further contended that the applicant had already resigned from the concerned trust and no prima facie material exists to establish his involvement. According to his memorandum statement, the trust, namely *Jan Seva Shiksha Ewam Samajik Utthan*, was constituted by his elder brother, Devnarayan Chakradhari, who merely showed the applicant as one of its trustees, and no specific overt act has been attributed to him. It is further submitted that the applicant had no knowledge of the alleged fraudulent activities of the co-accused and was himself misled by him. Learned counsel submits that the essential ingredients of the alleged offences are not attracted against the applicant and that the investigation does not disclose any material establishing his complicity. It is further submitted that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 31.07.2025, the prosecution has cited 22 witnesses, none of whom has been examined till date, and therefore the trial is likely to take considerable time. Placing reliance on the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Arvind Dham v. Directorate of Enforcement, Punjab*, *Sanjay Chandra v. CBI*, *State of Kerala v. Raneef*, *Gudikanti Narasimhulu v. Public Prosecutor* and *Hussainara Khatoon v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar*, learned counsel submits that prolonged pre-trial incarceration violates the applicant's right to personal liberty and speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution. It is lastly submitted that the applicant is the sole breadwinner of his family, is a permanent resident with no likelihood of absconding or tampering with the prosecution evidence, and is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court. Accordingly, it is



prayed that the applicant be enlarged on regular bail.

5. On the other hand learned State counsel opposes the bail application of the applicant and submits that the charge-sheet has been filed in the present case.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, and the material available on record, it is noticed that the earlier bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits by this Court vide order dated 03.12.2025 passed in MCRC No. 9835 of 2025. Thereafter, the applicant approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No. 3142 of 2026, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court, while disposing of the said petition, granted liberty to the applicant to renew his prayer for bail before this Court after the expiry of three months. Further, the applicant has remained in judicial custody since 31.07.2025, the charge-sheet has already been filed, none of the 22 prosecution witnesses has been examined till date, and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. In view of the aforesaid subsequent developments, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant has made out a case for grant of bail. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the second repeat bail application is allowed.
8. Let the Second Bail of the Applicant – **Golu Narayan Chakradhari**, involved in Crime No. 378/2025, registered at Police Station : Surajpur District - Surajpur (C.G) for the offence punishable under Sections 317(4), 318(2), 61(2)(A) and Section 66 (D) of the I.T. Act, be released



2026:CGHC:32716

on bail on furnishing **personal bond** with **two local sureties** 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.

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