CGHC010382782026 2026:CGHC:44695

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9234 of 2026

Sunita Bai Sonwani W/o Late Shri Jamuna Prasad Sonwani Aged About 42 Years R/o Sadak Para Gram Kunwa P.S. Takhatpur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. City Kotwali District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

... Non-Applicant(s)

For Applicant	:	Ms. Yogisha Singh Rajput, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Dy. Adv. Gen.

Hon'ble Mr. Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

15/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred Second Bail Application under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 381/2026, registered at Police Station : City Kotwali, District-Bilaspur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of Indian Penal Code.

2. The earlier first bail application of the applicant was rejected by this

Court for want of prosecution. Hence, the present second bail application.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that a report was lodged by Daulat Ram Thakur, Naib Nazir Grade-II, Office of the Tahsildar, Bilaspur (C.G.), alleging that the applicant, along with other co-accused persons, prepared forged documents and fabricated medical records to fraudulently obtain financial assistance of Rs. 4,00,000/- under the Government Snake Bite/Poisonous Animal Bite Death Assistance Scheme, thereby causing loss to the State exchequer. It is further alleged that the applicant manipulated official records in connection with the incident. On the basis of the said allegations, an FIR was registered against the applicant for offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, and he was subsequently arrested.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. She would further submit that the applicant is an illiterate and widowed woman and has no criminal antecedents. It is also contended that similarly situated co-accused persons facing allegations relating to the same Government scheme and the alleged fraudulent procurement of financial assistance have been granted anticipatory bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC (A) Nos. 1220/2026 and 1231/2026, arising out of Crime Nos. 331/2026 and 381/2026, respectively, vide order dated 04.08.2026. She would further submit that regular bail has also been granted to the

respective co-accused persons vide orders dated 18.08.2026 passed in MCRC Nos. 6251/2026, 6205/2026 and 6122/2026 and the applicant is in judicial custody since 19.06.2026 and charge-sheet has already been filed. Therefore, on the ground of parity and considering the period of detention, she prays for grant of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant of bail and submit that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. It is alleged that the applicant, in connivance with other co-accused persons, concealed the actual cause of death and fraudulently obtained financial assistance of Rs. 4,00,000/- under the Government scheme for death due to snake bite or poisonous animal bite, thereby causing wrongful loss to the State Exchequer. Accordingly, he prays for rejection of the bail application.

6. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the allegations levelled against the applicant, the material collected during investigation, the fact that similarly situated co-accused persons have been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the applicant being a lady, having no criminal antecedents and is in judicial custody since 19.06.2026, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. The allegations levelled against the applicant are matters to

be tested during trial and the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court. Further, the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude and continued pre-trial detention of the applicant would not serve any fruitful purpose. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am inclined to grant bail to the applicant.

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, she shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

(i) she 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 her from disclosing such fact to the Court;

(ii) she shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, &

(iii) she shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to her by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Kunal