



1

MCRC-30161-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE DEVNARAYAN MISHRA

ON THE 11<sup>th</sup> OF AUGUST, 2025MISC. CRIMINAL CASE No. 30161 of 2025*IMRAN KHAN**Versus**THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH*

.....  
Appearance:

Shri Mrigendra Singh Baghel - Senior Advocate (through video conferencing) with Ms. Akanksha Singh Chauhan - Advocate for the applicant.

Shri Santosh Yadav - Government Advocate for the respondent-State.  
.....

ORDER

This is the *first* bail application filed by the applicant under Section 483 of *Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita*, 2023 for grant of regular bail relating to Crime No.103/2025 registered at Police Station - Navanagar, District - Singrauli (M.P.) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 386, 120-B of IPC. The applicant is in custody since 23.05.2025.

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the applicant has submitted that the FIR is antedated. The applicant being a contractor, constructed a house for the complainant, who is a rehabilitated person. It is submitted that the complainant was not paying the amount of excess construction made by the applicant, therefore, a demand was being made in this regard, but instead of paying the amount, the complainant has threatened the applicant that he will



file a false report against the applicant and pursuant thereto, the applicant was trying to compromise the matter but even thereafter the FIR was registered against the applicant. It is further submitted that the applicant has already filed a complaint on 10.04.2025 against the complainant and other persons to the effect that these persons wanted to implicate the applicant falsely, but no action on the said complaint was taken. When the provisions of BNS, 2023 already came into effect, then the FIR was lodged against the applicant under Sections 420, 386, 120-B of IPC and it clearly demonstrates that the complaint was already made against the applicant and the matter could not be solemnized by the compromise. The applicant is not required in investigation. The trail will take to be concluded, hence, the applicant is entitled to be released on bail.

3. Learned counsel for the State has submitted that the applicant has a criminal record. Money transaction was proved by the documents, hence, the applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

4. Heard the parties and perused the case diary.

5. Looking to the facts and circumstances of the case coupled with the fact that the applicant is not required in investigation, this Court deems it appropriate to enlarge the applicant on bail, therefore, without commenting on the merits of the case, the application is **allowed**.

6. It is directed that **applicant-Imran Khan** shall be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond in a sum of **Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only)** with one surety in 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 the pendency of trial.

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

8. Accordingly, M.Cr.C. stands disposed of.

C.C. as per rules.

(DEVNARAYAN MISHRA)  
JUDGE

HK