



2026:CGHC:3309



2026:CGHC:3309

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8644 of 2025

Anurag Singh Raguvanshi S/o Ghanshyam Singh Aged About 34 Years R/o House No. 605, Malay Gokul Dham Society, Airport Road, 6th Floor, Block No. D, Indore (M.P.)

... Applicant

versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station - Cyber Police, Sarguja Range, District- Ambikapur (Sarguja) (C.G.)

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	: Mr. Malay Shrivastava, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	: Mr. Priyank Rathi, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

20.01.2026

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. 02/2025 registered at Police Station Cyber Police Sarguja, District Ambikapur (Sarguja) (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 111(iii) and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 66(d) of the Information Technology Act.
2. The prosecution case, in a nutshell, is that the complainant, Siddharth Gupta, lodged a written report stating that, in the name of share trading,



he deposited an amount of Rs. 9,95,000/- in the J-M Trading Application.

When the complainant demanded withdrawal of the said amount, he was informed that the server was not working properly, and consequently, he did not receive the money. Thereafter, the complainant lodged a written report, and on the basis of the said report, on 28.05.2025, the present FIR was registered against unknown persons.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the present applicant is an innocent person and has been falsely implicated in the aforesaid case. He further submits that there is not an iota of evidence against the present applicant and that, from the entire prosecution case, it is evident that a concocted case has been made against him. He also submits that the FIR was initially registered against unknown persons and that subsequently a compromise was entered into between the complainant and the present applicant, however, the concerned Trial Court rejected the compromise and, consequently, rejected the bail application of the applicant. So far as the criminal antecedents of the applicant are concerned, as pointed out by the learned State counsel, it is submitted that although the applicant has three criminal antecedents, he has been charge-sheeted in only one case, i.e., Crime No. 262 of 2025. In the remaining two cases, namely Crime Nos. 67 of 2025 and 229 of 2025, no proceedings have been initiated by the prosecution. He further submits that the present applicant has been in judicial custody since 01.07.2025, and that the conclusion of the trial may take considerable time. Therefore, he prays for grant of regular bail to the applicant.
4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposed the bail application of the present applicant and submitted that the charge-sheet has already been submitted before the competent Court in the present case.



5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, and further the fact that vide order dated 31.10.2025, learned counsel for the applicant was directed by this Court to explain the three criminal antecedents of a similar nature, it appears that pursuant thereto, learned counsel for the applicant has filed an affidavit explaining the same. In the said affidavit, it is stated that although the learned State counsel has submitted that the applicant has three criminal antecedents, he has been charge-sheeted in only one case, namely Crime No. 262 of 2025. In the remaining two cases, namely Crime Nos. 67 of 2025 and 229 of 2025, no proceedings have been initiated by the prosecution. Moreover, the charge-sheet in the present case has already been submitted before the competent Court, and the applicant has been in judicial custody since 01.07.2025. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant is entitled to be released on bail in the present case.
7. Let the Applicant – **Anurag Singh Raguvanshi**, involved in Crime No. 02/2025 registered at Police Station Cyber Police Sarguja, District Ambikapur (Sarguja)(C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 111(iii) and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 66(d) of the Information Technology Act, be released 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.

8. However, this Court hopes and trusts that the trial Court shall make an earnest endeavour to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible within a period of **six months** from the receipt of a certified copy of this order in accordance with law, if there is no legal impediment.
9. Office is directed to provide a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice