



CGHC010161302026



2026:CGHC:39924

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 4115 of 2026

Manoj Sahu S/o Budhram Sahu Aged About 32 Years R/o - Village Kumhali
Ward No. - 5, P.S.- Jamgaon, Tehsil – Patan – District - Durg (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Kharora,
District Raipur (C.G.)

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	: Mr. C.R. Sahu, Advocate.
For Non-applicant	: Ms. Laxmin Kashyap, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

11.09.2026

1. The applicant has preferred this First Bail Application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 311/2025, registered at Police Station - Kharora, District - Raipur (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 87 and 64(2)(d) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 4 and 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.
2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 21.05.2025, the father of the victim lodged a report at Police Station Kharora stating that on

14.05.2025 at about 01:00 p.m., his daughter/victim, aged about 16 years 10 months, had gone missing from the house without informing the family members. Despite making efforts to trace her amongst relatives and nearby places, she could not be found. On the basis of the said report, Crime No. 311/2025 was registered and investigation was taken up. During investigation, it was found that the applicant had enticed the victim, who was below 18 years of age, on the pretext of marriage and took her away to his village Kumni, District Durg, where he kept her for about six months and repeatedly established physical relations with her till 31.10.2025, as a result of which the victim became pregnant. Thereafter, on completion of investigation, charge-sheet was filed against the applicant for the aforesaid offences. During the course of trial, charges have been framed and the victim and her parents have been examined, who have supported the case of the prosecution.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the applicant neither abducted the victim nor committed the offences alleged against him. It is further submitted that the victim was having a love affair with the applicant and had accompanied him voluntarily and had not raised any objection during the alleged period of occurrence. He further submits that the allegations are false and baseless and that the prosecution has concocted a false story against the applicant. It is also submitted that the police did not conduct proper inquiry before implicating the applicant in the present case. He submits that the applicant has been in jail since 02.11.2025, conclusion of the trial may take some time, therefore, on these grounds, learned counsel prays that the applicant may be enlarged on bail.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of

bail and submits that the victim was admittedly below 18 years of age at the time of the incident and the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. She further submits that the victim has been examined before the learned trial Court and has categorically supported the prosecution case by stating that the applicant had taken her to his village by enticing her and thereafter kept her with him for about six months and repeatedly established physical relations with her, as a result of which she became pregnant. She further submits that the victim has also stated that her family members lodged a report and that she was subsequently recovered from the village of the applicant. It is further submitted that the victim as well as her parents have supported the prosecution case in their deposition before the learned trial Court. Therefore, looking to the age of the victim, the nature and gravity of the offence and the evidence available on record, the applicant is not entitled to be enlarged on bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary and other material place on record.
6. From perusal of the statement of the victim recorded before the learned trial Court, it transpires that she has categorically stated that the applicant had taken her to his village Kumni, District Durg, by enticing her and kept her at his house for about six months. She has further deposed that, during the said period, the applicant established physical relations with her on several occasions and that, as a result thereof, she became pregnant for about three months, which was subsequently terminated due to a fall in the course of bathing in a pond. The victim has further stated that her family members had lodged a report and that she was subsequently recovered by the police from the village of the applicant. The said deposition prima facie supports the material allegations levelled against the applicant. It is also apparent from the record that the victim

was aged about 16 years 10 months at the relevant time and, therefore, was below 18 years of age. It is further relevant that the victim and her parents have already been examined before the learned trial Court and their evidence supports the prosecution case.

7. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the age of the victim, the specific deposition of the victim regarding repeated sexual relations and the consequent pregnancy, coupled with the material available on record, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant does not deserve to be enlarged on bail at this stage.
8. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant namely - **Manoj Sahu**, involved in Crime No. 311/2025, registered at Police Station Kharora, District Raipur (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 87 and 64(2)(d) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 4 and 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, is hereby rejected.
9. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge