



CGHC010331612026

2026:CGHC:38115

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
MCRC No. 7909 of 2026

Priyanshu Baksel S/o Vishal Baksel Aged About 23 Years R/o Torwar Police Station Torwa, District- Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Station House Officer, Police Station, Sirgitti, District – Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- Non-applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Awadh Tripathi, Advocates.

For Non-applicant/State : Mr. Shubham Bajpai, Panel Lawyer.

RAJSHEKHAR
SONI
Digitally signed
by
RAJSHEKHAR
SONI

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

25.08.2026

- 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. 347/2026, registered at Police Station – Sirgitti, District – Bilaspur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 296, 3(5) and 351(3) of the BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act.
- The case of the prosecution, is that the complainant's elder sister, Anamika Khare, had a love marriage with one of the accused, Priyanshu Baksel, of her own free will. It is alleged that on 10.05.2026 at around 9:30 PM, the complainant and his friend K. Dikeshwar Rao were returning after purchasing clothes from 'Good Looking Men's Wear' shop situated at Nayapara Chowk, Anwari Bakshi Marg. It is further alleged that near a chaat stall in front of the said shop, they

encountered the accused persons, Priyanshu Baksel and Pakku @ Vivek Yadav. The prosecution alleges that harboring a previous enmity, the accused persons started hurling obscene abuses at the complainant and his friend. When the complainant objected to the abuse, both accused persons allegedly issued death threats and assaulted the complainant and his friend K. Dikeshwar Rao using a sharp object, a chair, as well as fists and kicks. As a result of this alleged assault, the complainant claims to have sustained injuries on his right wrist, thumb, and forehead, while his friend K. Dikeshwar Rao allegedly sustained injuries near his chest, right wrist, palm, and back. Thereafter, the crime was registered and the applicant was arrested. Hence, this application.

3. It is argued by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted that there after a total of 14 criminal antecedents of the applicant out of which 9 cases are pending. It is further submitted that the co-accused has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 07.08.2026 passed in MCRC No.7240/2026. The applicant is in jail since 13.05.2026 and trial is likely to take quite long time for its conclusion, therefore, on the ground of parity he may be granted bail.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application of the applicant and submits that there after a total of 14 criminal antecedents of the applicant out of which 9 cases are pending, but could not dispute the fact that co-accused has already been granted bail by this Court and the case of the present applicant is identical to that of the co-accused.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused all of the documents available on record.
6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that though there after a total of 14 criminal antecedents of the applicant out of which 9 cases are pending, but the co-accused has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 07.08.2026 passed in MCRC No.7240/2026, and the applicant is in jail since 13.05.2026 and conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, I am inclined to allow this application, on the ground of parity.
7. Let applicant – **Priyanshu Baksel**, involved in Crime No. 347/2026, registered at Police Station – Sirgitti, District – Bilaspur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 296, 3(5) and 351(3) of the BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, be released on bail on his furnishing **a personal bond with two sureties** in the like sum to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:-
 - (i) The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the trial court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.
 - (ii) The applicant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the trial court may proceed against him under Section 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
 - (iii) In case, the applicant misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure his presence, proclamation under Section 84 of BNSS. is issued and the applicant fails to appear before the court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against him, in accordance with law, under Section 209 of the Bharatiya Nyaya

Sanhita.

(iv) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case, (ii) framing of charge and (iii) recording of statement under Section 351 of BNSS. If in the opinion of the trial court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the trial court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

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

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

Rajshekhar