



CGHC010263862026



2026:CGHC:40475

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 6332 of 2026

- Ajay Singh Rajput S/o Bhuvneshwar Singh Rajput, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Sardha, Thana Lormi, Distt. - Mungeli (C.G.)
--- Applicant

versus

- State of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. Lalpur, Teh. Lormi, Distt. Mungeli (C.G.)
--- Non-Applicant

WITH

MCRC No. 7723 of 2026

- Paragraj (Wrongly Mentioned As Parag) Singh Rajput S/o Balveer Singh Rajput, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Village- Jhaphal, P.S. and Tahsil- Lormi, District- Mungeli (C.G.)
---Applicant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh Through- Station House Officer, Police Station- Lalpur, District- Mungeli (C.G.)
--- Non-Applicant

WITH

MCRC No. 6652 of 2026

- Paleshwar Singh Rajput S/o Late Shri Ramdhun Rajput, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village- Ranigaon, Lormi Police Station- Lalpur, District- Mungeli (C.G.) (Deponent Address Wrongly Mention In The Page No. 11 Of The Bail Order)
---Applicant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station- Lalpur, Mungeli, District- Mungeli (C.G.)
--- Non-Applicant

Digitally
signed by
PREETI
KUMARI
Date:
2026.09.18
11:00:58
+0530

For Applicant (in MCRC/6332/2026)	:	Mr. Awadh Tripathi, Advocate.
For Applicant (in MCRC/ 7723/2026)	:	Mr. Niraj Baghel, Advocate.
For Applicant (in MCRC/ 6652/2026)	:	Mr. Prafull N. Bharat, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Keshav Dewangan, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/ State	:	Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Deputy Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Judgment on Board

16.09.2026

1. Since the above-mentioned three bail applications arise out of same crime number, they are clubbed and heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.
2. These are the first bail applications filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), for grant of regular bail to the applicants who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 40/2026 registered at Police Station – Lalpur, District - Mungeli (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 61(2), 103(1), 140(2) and 238 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 22.03.2026, Balveer Singh lodged a missing person report regarding his brother, Damodar Singh Rajput, at Police Station Lalpur. During the course of investigation, co-accused Sanjay Yadav was arrested on 30.03.2026. His memorandum statement was recorded, wherein he

stated that co-accused Ranjeet Singh Rajput alias Munna and Rampal Rajput had directed him to commit the murder of the deceased, Damodar Singh Rajput, for consideration. He further stated that he had met the other co-accused persons and, pursuant to the conspiracy, they planned to commit the murder of the deceased, which was thereafter committed on 21.03.2026. On the basis of the memorandum statement of co-accused Sanjay Yadav, the involvement of 15 accused persons came to light, out of whom 4 were found to be juveniles. Accordingly, the FIR was registered against the accused persons. Thereafter, the police completed the investigation and filed the charge-sheet before the competent Court.

4. Learned Senior Advocate appearing for the applicants would argue that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that there is no material in the charge-sheet connecting the applicants with the alleged offence. He would also submit that the applicants have been implicated merely on the basis of suspicion. Learned counsel further submits that there was a property dispute between the deceased and his son, namely, Sanjay Singh Rajput, and this fact is evident from a document forming part of the charge-sheet, wherein it has been stated that Sanjay Singh Rajput has no right over the property of the deceased, Damodar Singh Rajput. It is further contended that co-accused Sanjay Yadav and other co-accused persons committed the murder of the deceased with the intention of committing robbery in the house of Damodar Singh Rajput. He would contend that the

presence and involvement of co-accused Sanjay Yadav have been ascertained from the CCTV footage. Learned counsel would further submit that, on perusal of the entire charge-sheet, there is no eye-witness to the incident and that the names of the present applicants came into light from the memorandum statements of the co-accused person. It is also argued that co-accused Sanjay Yadav and the son of the deceased, namely, Sanjay Singh Rajput, were in contact with each other through their mobile phones from 19.03.2026 to 26.03.2026, however, no action has been taken against them so far. It is further submitted that the applicants have been in custody since 30.03.2026 and have no criminal antecedents. Thus, looking to the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, learned counsel prays that the applicants may kindly be enlarged on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel appearing for the State opposes the bail application and submits that the present case involves an alleged contract killing. It is submitted that co-accused Ranjeet Singh Rajput alias Munna and Rampal Rajput had allegedly given a contract to co-accused Sanjay Yadav to kill the deceased, Damodar Singh. He further submits that, on the basis of the CCTV footage, co-accused Sanjay Yadav was arrested and, during the course of investigation, it was revealed that he, along with other co-accused persons, had committed the murder of Damodar Singh on 21.03.2026. Learned State counsel further submits that the police have seized an amount of Rs.84,000/- from the possession of co-

accused Sanjay Yadav, a four-wheeler allegedly belonging to him, and mobile phones of all the accused persons. He further submits that sufficient material is available in the charge-sheet connecting the present applicants with the alleged offence. Therefore, he submits that the bail applications deserve to be rejected.

6. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
7. The present is a case where there is an allegation of contract killing. In such a case, the prosecution has to establish a combination of criminal conspiracy under Section 61 of BNS and the murder of Damodar Singh Rajput. The prosecution is also required to build an unassailable case relying on a complete chain of circumstantial evidence: -
 - the element of criminal conspiracy;
 - the meeting of minds between the master-mind and the hitman who takes the contract;
 - all accused persons sharing a common intention and agreeing to commit the illegal act;
 - the subsequent conduct of the accused persons, their surrounding circumstances, and their joint acts.

There must be an allegation of a financial transaction including bank trails, call detail records, and tower locations. The case against the accused persons should not be based on hypothesis, there should be discovery of facts according to the provisions of Section 27 of Evidence Act and the allegation should

be corroborated with independent evidence.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the offence, the allegations levelled against the applicants, and the material available on record, particularly the fact that the CDR has been made part of the charge-sheet, there is no material to establish that co-accused Sanjay Yadav and the present applicants were together during the relevant period in connection with the commission of the murder of Damodar Singh Rajput, it is further evident from the record that co-accused Sanjay Yadav was taken into custody by the police and, subsequently, his memorandum statement was recorded, the present applicants have been arrested on the basis of the memorandum statement of co-accused Sanjay Yadav, however, neither in the said memorandum statement nor in the statements recorded under Section 180 of the BNSS is there any specific allegation or material indicating the involvement of the present applicants in the commission of the murder of Damodar Singh Rajput, further, no incriminating article has been seized from the possession of the present applicants, though certain accused persons have been named by co-accused Sanjay Yadav in his memorandum statement and allegations have been levelled against some of the other co-accused persons regarding their participation in the commission of the murder, the material available against the present applicants requires consideration in the aforesaid background, considering also the fact that the charge-sheet has already been filed, the applicants have

been in custody since 30.03.2026, and charges have not yet been framed, this Court is of the view that the applicants are entitled to be released on bail in the present case.

9. Accordingly, the bail applications of the applicants is **allowed**. It is directed that in the event of the applicants executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety each in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, they shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

(i) they 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 them from disclosing such fact to the Court;

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

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

10. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court for necessary information and compliance.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE