



CGHC010246582026



2026:CGHC:27985

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**MCRCA No. 1036 of 2026**

1 - Anand Basantilalji Chhajed S/o- Basantilalji Shantilalji Chhajed, Aged About 41 Years R/o- Ward No. 11, Ashok Market, 2nd Floor, Nayapara, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Devendra Nagar, Commissionerate Raipur, District - Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. Divy Jha, Advocate.

For Non-applicant/State : Ms. Nupur Trivedi, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order On Board****07.07.2026**

1. The applicant has preferred this application under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of

Anticipatory Bail, as he is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 0105/2026, registered at Police Station – Devendra Nagar, Raipur (C.G.) for the alleged commission of offence punishable under Section 306 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023

2. The prosecution story, in brief, is that one Shreyansh Jain, S/o Shri Uttamchand Jain, made a complaint alleging therein that during the stock audit of gold and silver in his shop styled as Anopchand Tilokchand Jewellers, Pandri, gold ornaments including Gold bangle 01 piece weighing 69.54 grams, Gold earring 04 pairs (08 pieces) weighing 144.620 grams, Gold necklace 01 piece weighing 58.52 grams and Chain set 03 pieces weighing 24.520 grams, total weight 297.20 grams were found missing. Upon such missing of gold jewellery, he questioned the employees working in his shop and the applicant told that another employee Nitesh Mehta had kept 02 pairs of gold earrings with him and he brought 02 pairs of gold earrings weighing 74.58 grams, but he did not tell about the rest of the gold ornaments. Thereafter, when Nitesh Mehta was searched whereabouts of him, it came to know that he had gone to his native village without informing anyone. It has been alleged that the present applicant and said Nitesh Mehta together had stolen gold ornaments weighing 297.20 grams, valued at Rs. 30 lakh from the shop. On the basis of the said complaint, the police registered the present FIR against the present applicant and one Nitesh Mehta.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that the applicant fairly disclosed the movement of gold ornaments and the case has been registered only in order to pressurize the applicant for further recovery of the remaining jewellery, regarding which the applicant has no knowledge. He further submits that the alleged stolen ornaments were missing from the counter of one Nitesh Mehta who was working in the first floor of the shop and he is reported to be absconded. He also submits that the applicant had been working as a salesman of the shop for almost 09 years and he himself helped in recovery of the jewellery. Learned counsel also submits that the present applicant has no criminal antecedent and the main accused is absconding, therefore, he may be extended privilege of anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel oppose the submissions made on behalf of the applicant and submits that the applicant was a salesman of the jewellery shop and when an audit of the stock was done, the embezzlement of jewellery valuing Rs.30 Lakh came to fore. Therefore, considering the nature and gravity of the offence, the applicant may not be granted anticipatory bail.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.

6. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence, the material on record, and further considering the fact the applicant was a salesman of the jewelry shop and allegedly defrauded his employer to the tune of Rs.30 Lakh, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.
7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant – **Anand Basantilaji Chhajer**, involved in Crime No. 0105/2026, registered at Police Station – Devendra Nagar, Raipur (C.G.) for the alleged commission of offence punishable under Section 306 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, is **rejected**.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice