



CGHC010306542026



2026:CGHC:42931

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 7476 of 2026

Deepak Chakradhari S/o Manohar Ram Aged About 28 Years A Daily Wage Computer Operator (Suspended), District Cooperative Central Bank, Ambikapur, District Sarguja, R/o Village Akhorakala, P.S. Jainagar Latori, Tahsil Latori, District Surajpur (C.G.)

... Applicant(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer Sitapur, District Surguja (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant(s)

For Applicant : Mr. Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate.

For Non-Applicant/State : Mr. Jitendra Shrivastava, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

05/10/2026

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.188/2026 registered at Police Station Sitapur, District Sarguja (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 3(5), 316(5), 318 and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that pursuant to an enquiry

conducted under the directions of the Collector, Surguja, a written complaint was submitted by the In-charge Chief Accountant, District Cooperative Central Bank, Ambikapur, alleging that the applicant/accused Deepak Chakradhari, along with co-accused persons, while being posted in the District Cooperative Central Bank, Branch Petla, had fraudulently obtained signatures of 127 farmers and sanctioned loans in their names, thereby causing alleged fraud/misappropriation of an amount of Rs.1,92,82,096/-. On the basis of the said complaint, the aforesaid offence was registered against the applicant and other co-accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He would further submit that the applicant was merely working as a daily wage Computer Operator and had no authority to sanction or disburse loans or to take any financial decision. He would further submit that there is no allegation of any pecuniary benefit having been derived by the applicant and no document relating to the alleged fraudulent transactions bears his signature. He would further contend that the prosecution case is primarily based upon documentary evidence, which is already in the custody of the Bank/investigating agency. He also submits that 61 farmers have allegedly submitted affidavits regarding availing and repayment of loans and the applicant has no criminal antecedents, charge-sheet has been filed before the competent Court and he is in custody since 19.06.2026.

4. He would further submit that co-accused Lalita Sinha has been granted anticipatory bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court in M.Cr.C.(A) No.1089/2026 vide order dated 13.07.2026, co-accused Jogiram has been granted anticipatory bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court in M.Cr.C.(A) No.1145/2026 vide order dated 20.07.2026 and co-accused Sainath Kerketta has also been granted anticipatory bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court in M.Cr.C.(A) No.1302/2026 vide order dated 12.08.2026. He would further submit that co-accused Shivshankar Soni, whose anticipatory bail application was rejected by this Court, was subsequently granted Interim bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Crl.) No.14365/2026 vide order dated 13.08.2026. He would further submit that co-accused Bhupendra Singh has also been granted Interim bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. He submits that the case of the present applicant is similar to that of the aforesaid co-accused persons and therefore, the applicant is also entitled to be released on bail on the ground of parity. Accordingly, he prays for grant of regular bail to the applicant.
5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that the applicant has been implicated on the basis of the material collected during investigation showing his involvement in the alleged fraudulent loan transactions. He would further submit that the allegations relate to fraudulent sanction of loans in the names of 127 farmers involving an amount of Rs.1,92,82,096/- and that the statements of the concerned farmers recorded during investigation do not support the defence version.

Accordingly, he prays for rejection of the bail application. It is further relevant to note that co-accused Lalita Sinha, Jogiram and Sainath Kerketta have been granted anticipatory bail by coordinate Bench of this Court in M.Cr.C.(A) Nos.1089/2026, 1145/2026 and 1302/2026 vide orders dated 13.07.2026, 20.07.2026 and 12.08.2026, respectively. Further, co-accused Shivshankar Soni and Bhupendra Singh have also been granted Interim bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

6. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary and the material available on record.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegations, the role attributed to the present applicant, who was working as a daily wage Computer Operator, the fact that the alleged transactions are primarily based upon documentary evidence, the applicant has no criminal antecedents, charge-sheet has been filed and he is in custody since 19.06.2026 and further considering the fact that out of the co-accused persons involved in the same crime, three co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail by coordinate Benches of this Court and two co-accused have been granted interim bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the allegations against the present applicant being similar in nature, I am inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant on the ground of parity.
8. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant is **allowed**. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond

for a sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

- (i) he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such fact to the Court;
- (ii) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, &
- (iii) he shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Kunal