



1

MCRG-38841-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE DEVNARAYAN MISHRA

ON THE 27th OF OCTOBER, 2025MISC. CRIMINAL CASE No. 38841 of 2025*ANIL KUMAR VERMA**Versus**THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH*

.....
Appearance:

*Shri Mrigendra Singh - Senior Advocate through video conferencing
assisted by Shri Jaydeep Kourav - Advocate for the applicant.*

*Shri Shailendra Mishra - Deputy Government Advocate for the
respondent/State.*

.....

ORDER

This is the fifth application filed by the applicant under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail relating to FIR/Crime No.1065/2024 registered at Police Station Waidhan, District Singrauli, for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. The applicant is in jail since 06.10.2024.

2. The applicant's first bail application was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 27.01.2025 passed in M.Cr.C. No.2277 of 2025, his second bail application was dismissed on merits vide order dated 21.03.2025 passed in M.Cr.C. No.8763 of 2025, his third bail application was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 21.04.2025 passed in M.Cr.C. No.16632 of 2025



and his fourth bail application was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 10.07.2025 passed in M.Cr.C. No.23494 of 2025.

3. Learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the applicant has submitted that the other co-accused person namely Surendra Bahadur Singh and the beneficiary namely Rambabu Vaishya have already been granted the benefit of bail. It is alleged against the applicant that in his shop, the forged order dated 01.07.2025 of Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) was prepared, but the report received from the FSL reveals that in the hard disk drive recovered from the applicant's computer, no such document or forged order was found. Trial is still pending and will take time to be concluded, hence, taking into account the fact that other co-accused persons have already been enlarged on bail and the applicant's custody period, he be also enlarged on bail.

4. Learned Deputy Government Advocate has opposed the bail application and has submitted that the forged document was prepared by this applicant. He was the main offender, hence, no case of bail is made out in his favour.

5. Heard the parties and perused the case diary.

6. From perusal of case diary, the prosecution case is that the co-accused Rambabu Vaishya had purchased an agricultural land bearing survey No.715/1(s) admeasuring 0.0225 @ 227.925 square meters from Jayram Shah and Mahendra Sahu in the Municipal Area of Singrauli. Subsequently, Mahendra Sahu sold this land to Anita Shah on 12.12.2022. The purchaser of the land namely Rambabu Vaishya had filed mutation proceeding before the



Sub Divisional Officer Singrauli. He had appointed Surendra Bahadur Singh as his counsel. The case was registered as Revenue Case No.0030/2023-24. During this, the co-accused Rambabu Vaishya came into contact with two persons namely Raghvendra Gupta and Ashok Gupta, who had taken Rs.1,20,000/- and Rs.1,30,000/- from him for getting the order of mutation in his favour and also assured him that the mutation order shall be passed in his favour. When Rambabu Vaishya told this fact to his counsel, Surendra Bahadur Singh, Advocate that Raghvendra Gupta and Ashok Gupta had told him his land had already been mutated on 12.07.2024, on that, the co-accused Surendra Bahadur Singh applied for certified copy of the order in which incomplete order-sheets were supplied, but the land was shown as mutated in the favour of co-accused Rambabu Vaishya. During investigation, it was found that forged order dated 01.07.2024 including the seal, signature was prepared and a certified copy of the order was submitted before the concerned Patwari and on that, the Patwari has mutated the land in favour of Rambabu Vaishya. During investigation, it was found that this applicant with the conspiracy of other co-accused persons has prepared the forged document in his computer, but from the forensic report, it is clear that the document was not found in his computer. The applicant is running his shop of computer typing and printing.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances brought on record coupled with the facts that the other co-accused persons have already been enlarged on bail and trial will take time to be concluded, this Court deems it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on bail. Thus, without commenting



anything on the merits of the case, the application is **allowed**.

8. It is directed that applicant shall be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of **Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only)** with one solvent surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned for his appearance before the said Court on all such dates as may be fixed by that Court in this regard during pendency of trial.

9. It is further directed that the applicant shall comply with the provisions of Section 480(3) of BNSS.

10. Accordingly, Misc. Criminal Case stands disposed of.

Certified copy as per rules.

(DEVNARAYAN MISHRA)
JUDGE