



CGHC010315322026



2026:CGHC:36353

NAFR

RUCHI
YADAV

Digitally
signed by
RUCHI
YADAV

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 7560 of 2026

1 - Subhash Devangan S/o Raju @ Rajendra Devangan Aged About 20 Years
Shiv Nagar, New Changorabhata, P.S.- D.D. Nagar, District- Raipur (C.G.)

... Applicant(s)

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station- DD Nagar, Raipur, (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant(s)	:	Mr. Akash Mishra, Advocate
For Respondent(s)/State	:	Mr. Sourabh Sahu, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

14.08.2026

1. The present is the **first bail application** filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, "BNSS"), seeking grant of regular bail to the Applicant, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 598/2026 registered at Police Station DD Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.), for the offences punishable under

Sections 296, 351(3), 115(2), 109(1), 238(b), 118(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. According to the prosecution, on 13.12.2025 at about 9:30 p.m., the injured Jeevan Devangan and Piyush Soni went to Changorabhata near Sheetla Mandir, where the Applicant/Accused Subhash Devangan and co-accused Raju Devangan alias Rajendra Devangan allegedly abused Jeevan Devangan over a property partition dispute. It is alleged that, on his objection, the Applicant/Accused assaulted Jeevan Devangan several times with a knife with an intention to cause his death, causing serious injuries. Piyush Soni, who intervened, was also assaulted and injured. As per the medical reports, both injured persons sustained serious injuries on sensitive parts of their bodies. The knife allegedly used in the incident was thrown into a pond. Thus, prima facie, the material on record discloses the involvement of the Applicant/Accused in the alleged offence.
3. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the co-accused, who is the father of the Applicant, has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 10.07.2026 passed in MCRC No. 4743 of 2026. Therefore, the Applicant also deserves to be extended the benefit of parity. It is further submitted that the Applicant has been in judicial custody since 21.12.2025, the charge-sheet has been filed and he has no criminal antecedents. It is also submitted that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. On these grounds, learned counsel prays that the Applicant be enlarged on regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail and submits that the case diary is not available with him. It is further submitted that the co-accused, who is the father of the Applicant, was granted bail as the order granting bail records specific allegations against the present Applicant regarding assaulting the injured persons and causing injuries to them. Therefore, considering the specific role attributed to the present Applicant, learned State counsel prays that the present bail application be rejected.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
6. The Applicant seeks bail mainly on the ground of parity with the co-accused, who is his father and has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 10.07.2026 passed in MCRC No. 4743 of 2026. However, from a perusal of the said order, it appears that specific allegations have been levelled against the present Applicant regarding assaulting the injured persons and causing injuries to them. Thus, the role attributed to the present Applicant is distinguishable from that of the co-accused who has been granted bail. Therefore, the Applicant is not entitled to the benefit of parity. Considering the nature of allegations, the specific role attributed to the Applicant and 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.
7. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant- **Subhash Devangan** involved in Crime No. 598/2026 registered at Police Station DD Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 296, 351(3), 115(2), 109(1), 238(b), 118(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya

Sanhita, 2023, is **rejected**.

8. Needless to say that the trial Court concerned is at liberty to proceed and conclude the trial expeditiously.
9. The Office is directed to provide a certified copy of this order to the trial Court for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Ruchi