



2026:CGHC:27436

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1007 of 2026

Santosh Kumar Dewangan S/o Lt. Jugulram Dewangan Aged About 65 Years
R/o The Parksyde, House No. B-002, Kachna, District - Raipur (C.G.) (As Per
Correct Details)

... Applicant

versus

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

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Sameer Rigri, Advocate.

For Non-Applicant/State : Ms. Ritika Verma, Panel Lawyer.

PREETI
KUMARI
Digitally
signed by
PREETI
KUMARI
Date:
2026.07.03
17:08:36
+0530

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

03.07.2026

1. This first anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bhartiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed by the applicant, who is
apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 197/2026
registered at Police Station – Arang, District - Raipur (C.G.) for the offence
punishable under Sections 115(2), 296, 3(5), 324(4), 331(3) and 351(2)
of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. As per the prosecution case, on 16.04.2026, the complainant, Suresh
Kumar Dewangan, lodged a complaint alleging that the present applicant,
Santosh Kumar Dewangan (uncle of the complainant), along with his son,
forcibly entered the complainant's shop, abused and assaulted him with
fists, and damaged the computer, printer, and television screen kept in the

shop. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, an offence under Sections 115(2), 296, 3(5), 324(4), 331(3), and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, was registered against the present applicant vide Crime No. 197/2026 at Police Station Arang, District Raipur (C.G.).

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the offence in question. It is further submitted that the complainant is the nephew of the applicant, and the dispute between them arose on account of a family property dispute. Learned counsel further submits that the injuries sustained by the complainant are simple in nature and that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedents. Therefore, it is contended that the applicant is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail, and the present application deserves to be allowed.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of allegation made against the applicant and the fact that the complainant is the nephew of the applicant, and the dispute between them arose on account of a family property dispute, further considering the fact that the injuries sustained by the complainant are simple in nature and that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedents, this Court deems it appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the present applicant.
7. Accordingly, the instant MCRCA is **allowed** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant - **Santosh Kumar Dewangan**, on executing a personal bond and one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the arresting Officer, they shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

(a) he 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 him from disclosing such fact to the Court.

(b) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.

(c) he shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

(d) the applicant and the surety shall submit a copy of his adhaar card along with a coloured postcard full size photo having printed the adhaar number on it, which shall be verified by the trial Court.

(e) he shall not involve himself in any offence of similar nature in future.

**Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice**