



CGHC010339642026



2026:CGHC:39399

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8299 of 2026

Rekha Chandel W/o Anand Chandel Aged About 49 Years R/o Plot No. C-102, Ootra, Rest C H S. Lokhandwala, Township. Kandivali, (East) Mumbai, Maharashtra,

... Applicant (s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The P. S. Pankhajur, Kanker District Kanker C. G.

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	: Mr. N. Naha Roy, Advocate
For State	: Mr. Amit Buxi, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge
Order On Board

08/09/2026

1. Applicant has filed this bail application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail as she has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 84 of 2025 registered at Police Station –Pakhanjur, District- Kanker (C.G.) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 318 (4), 338, 336 (3), 340(2), 61 (2), 3 (5) of BNS.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 24.05.2025 complainant lodged report in the concerned police station that when he was residing in America, he received a phone call in which he was informed that there is one Zealapp View Pvt. Ltd. at Mumbai in which he will be appointed as Chief Technical Officer and will be provided 10% share and was given a bank account number for transfer of Rs.1 crores. Pursuant thereto, complainant has transferred Rs.43,44,900/- in the bank account of applicant. When complainant came to know about the fraud committed with him, he lodged report and applicant was arrested.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that according to case of complainant, maternal uncle i.e. co-accused Anand Chandel has informed about project and investment in the Zealapp View Pvt. Ltd. company and to appoint complainant as Chief Technical Officer. He submits that scheme as shown to complainant is by co-accused and not by present applicant. Thus as per allegation, only amount has been transferred in the bank account of applicant from which it is apparent that there is no direct involvement of applicant in commission of crime. Hence, the applicant may be released on bail.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the submission made by learned counsel for the applicant. However, he does not dispute the submission of learned counsel for the applicant that as per allegation, there was conversation between the co-accused Anand Chandel and complainant. He however, submits that amount is deposited in the bank account of applicant. He also submits that applicant is resident of Mumbai.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents placed on record.
6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation, applicant is a lady, investigation is complete and charge sheet has been filed, without commenting anything on merit of the case , I am inclined to allow the application.
7. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. It is directed that the applicant shall be released on regular bail on her furnishing a personal bail bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the Court on the conditions that:-.

“(a) The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that she 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.

(b) The applicant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through her counsel. In case of her absence, without sufficient cause, the trial court may proceed against her under Section 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(c) In case, the applicant misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure her presence, proclamation under Section 84 of BNSS. is issued and the applicant fail to appear before the Court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against them, in accordance with law, under Section 209 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(d) 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 her in accordance with law.”

8. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Praveen