



CGHC010319252026

2026:CGHC:42910

NAFR

REKHA
SINGH

Digitally signed by
REKHA SINGH
DN: cn=REKHA
SINGH, ou=HIGH
COURT, o=HIGH
COURT OF
CHHATTISGARH,
st=Chhattisgarh,
c=IN
Date: 2026.10.05
14:16:12 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 7661 of 2026

1 - Yogesh Kumar Sahu S/o Rajendra Kumar Sahu Aged About 36 Years R/o Permanent Address Village Khamhariya P.S. Partan Distt. Durg Chhattisgarh Present Address - House No. C-604, Palmhood Residency, Narsingh Vihar Katul Board, Durg P.S. Supella District Durg Chhattisgarh

...Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer Supela District Durg Chhattisgarh

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Sanjay Agrawal, Advocate
For Non-applicant	:	Mr.Keshav Gupta, GA
For Objector	:	Mr. Ankush Soni, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order On Board

05.10.2026

1) This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 961/2026 registered at Police Station Supela, District Durg (C.G.) for alleged commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 318(4) & 61(2) of BNS.

- 2)** The prosecution story, in brief, is that the applicant was running a share trading business in the name of Arena Capital during the year 2025-2026. He allured customers to invest in his company by promising 100% enhancement of their investments and a return of 10% per month. Many investors invested their money in said company and, according to the allegations contained in the FIR, the present applicant grabbed a sum of Rs.15 lakhs from the complainant, Raju Namdev. The FIR was lodged by the complainant on 08.07.2026 and, subsequently, the same was registered for commission of the offence as stated above. Hence, the present bail application.
- 3)** Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that there are a total of four accused persons, out of whom three have already been granted anticipatory bail by the Coordinate Bench and the allegations against the present applicant are also almost similar. He would further submit that the charge-sheet has already been filed and the applicant is in jail since 09.07.2026. With regard to the criminal antecedents, he would submit that in all six cases, the applicant has already been granted anticipatory bail by the competent Court. Thus, he would pray for grant of bail.
- 4)** On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the bail application and submit that the present applicant had not only collected money from the complainant, Raju Namdev, but also from various other investors, and the total embezzled amount comes to Rs.3,74,00,000/-. He would further submit that there are six live criminal antecedents against the present applicant. Therefore, his bail application deserves

to be rejected.

- 5) Mr. Soni, Advocate appearing for the complainant would oppose the bail application. He would submit that the present applicant has a total of 11 criminal antecedents registered across the country. He would contend that the bail application deserves to be rejected.
- 6) I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
- 7) The primary objectives of examining an accused person's criminal antecedents during bail proceedings are:
 - (i) to assess the likelihood of compliance with the bail conditions and ensure that the accused will not flee or jump bail;
 - (ii) to determine whether there is a habitual pattern of committing similar or grave offences; and
 - (iii) to evaluate the risk of tampering with evidence, obstructing the ongoing investigation, or intimidating witnesses.
- 8) Having considered the facts and circumstances of the present case, particularly the fact that the co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail on the ground that they were collection agents working under the present applicant, and one of them was a lady, whereas there is a specific allegation against the present applicant that he collected and allegedly embezzled a sum of Rs.3,74,00,000/- from various investors,

and further considering that there are six live criminal antecedents against the present applicant, which are relevant for assessing the possibility of repetition of similar offences, this Court is of the considered opinion that the case of the present applicant is distinguishable from that of the co-accused and no case for grant of bail is made out. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected**.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE