



2026:CGHC:3711



2026:CGHC:3711

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1973 of 2025

Shanti Lal Chopda S/o Late Champa Lal Chopda Aged About 61 Years
R/o House No. 2 Chopda Compound, Azad Ward No. 37, Ganjpara
Durg, District Durg C.G. **... Applicant**

versus

The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Additional Superintendent Of Police
Economic Offence Wing / Anti-Corruption Bureau District Raipur C.G.
... Non-applicant

For Applicant : Mr. AS Kachhwaha, Advocate.

For Non-applicant/State : Dr. Sourabh Pande, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice Order On Board

21.01.2026

1. The applicant has preferred this Second anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of Anticipatory Bail, apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 05/2025, registered at Police



Station – EOW/ACB, Raipur (C.G.) for alleged commission of offence punishable under Sections 120-B, 409 IPC and also under Sections 13(1), 13(2) and 7(C) of Prevention of Corruption Act. 1st anticipatory bail application was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 18.11.205 passed in M.Cr.C(A) No.1803 of 2025.

2. As per the prosecution, in light of the scheme namely "Hamar Lab" which is a district level health center, the Directorate of Health Services (DHS) had issued a demand letter to Chhattisgarh Medical Services Corporation Limited (CGMSCL) for purchase of medical equipment's and reagents under the said scheme. The CGMSCL issued tender bearing No. 182/EQP/CGMSCL/2022-23 dated 26.08.2022. Seeking rate contract of equipment's, wherein one Mokshit Corporation Private Limited was declared as L-1 bidder. It has been alleged that the officers of CGMSCL has entered into criminal conspiracy with Mokshit Corporation Private Limited by making tailor made conditions and technical specifications in the tender to benefit Mokshit Corporation Private Limited. It has been further alleged that officers of CGMSCL had made unnecessary purchases in order to give profit to the Mokshit Corporation Private Limited which resulted in a total loss of 411 Crores. Based on the said allegations, offences as mentioned in the 1st para have been registered against the present Applicant. Hence, this application.



3. The learned counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant is completely innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that no evidence has been collected during the course of investigation to show the participation of the present applicant in the instant case. He argued that the applicant's son is no doubt involved in the present case but his regular bail application has been rejected and so far as the present applicant is concerned, he seeks indulgence of this Court for grant of anticipatory bail to him.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submitted that identically situated co-accused including the applicant's son namely Shashank Chopda's regular bail application was rejected by this Court and they have challenged the by filing SLP before the Supreme Court, which was also dismissed, therefore, the present anticipatory bail application of the applicant is also liable to be rejected.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
6. Considering the facts & circumstances of the case, allegations levelled against the applicant in the FIR and further considering that applicant's son namely Shashank Chopda's regular bail application was rejected by this Court leading to dismissal of SLP



2026:CGHC:3711

by Supreme Court also, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

7. Accordingly, the Second Anticipatory Bail application of the applicant – **Shanti Lal Chopda**, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 in connection with Crime No. 05/2025, registered at Police Station – EOW/ACB, Raipur (C.G.) for alleged commission of offence punishable under Sections 120-B, 409 IPC and also under Sections 13(1), 13(2) and 7(C) of Prevention of Corruption Act, is hereby **rejected**.
8. Office is directed to provide a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice