



CGHC010287632026

2026:CGHC:40842

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 6766 of 2026

Vikas Yadav S/o Arun Yadav Aged About 27 Years R/o Ward No. 1 Chandrapur
Police Station Chandrapur, District Sakti (C.G.) **... Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Police Station Jutmil Raigarh, District Raigarh
(C.G.) **... Non-applicant**

Digitally
signed by
ALLENA
ANJANI
KUMAR
Date:
2026.09.21
13:22:40
+0530

For Applicant : Ms. Minakshi Gupta, Advocate.

For Non-Applicant/State : Ms. Laxmeen Kashyap, P.L.

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAKESH MOHAN PANDEY)

Order on Board

18/09/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this First Bail Application under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No.128/2026, registered at Police Station Jutemill, Raigarh, District Raigarh (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 137(2), 64 of BNS and Section 6 of POCSO Act.
2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 18.04.2026 a missing report was lodged by the brother-in-law of the victim stating therein that the victim is his sister-in-law, aged about 16 years 5 months was missing since 17.04.2026. Subsequently, the victim was recovered from the

company of the applicant and on the basis of which, FIR was lodged against the applicant, pursuant to which, the offences, as stated above, were registered against him.

3. Victim and her mother are present through the video conferencing and raised strong objection with respect to grant of bail to the applicant.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant would submit that the victim on her own will accompanied the applicant and the applicant has not committed any sexual assault. He would further submit that the victim has already been examined before the learned trial Court, in which, she has not supported the case of the prosecution. It is also contended by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is in jail since 21.04.2026 and conclusion of trial may take some considerable time. He, therefore, prays for grant of bail to the applicant.
5. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the bail application and contend that the on the date of incident, victim was minor girl and she was taken away by the applicant without consent of her parents. It is also contended that the victim in her statement has supported the case of the prosecution and that, there are serious allegations of sexual abuse against the present applicant, and therefore, the bail application deserves to be dismissed.
6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and looking to the fact that at the time of incident, the victim was below 18 years of age and that the victim has supported the case of the prosecution and

considering the fact that there are two previous criminal cases against the present applicant and further that the victim has opposed the bail application of the applicant, I am not inclined to grant bail to the present applicant. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected**.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)

JUDGE

Anjani