



CGHC010343382026



2026:CGHC:40256

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1467 of 2026

- Krishna Kumar Yadav S/o Bulaki Ram Yadav Aged About 49 Years Occupation Public Servant (Patwari, Halka No.21, Village Ludeg) Resident Of Village- Ludeg, Tehsil- Pathalgaon District Jashpur (Chhattisgarh)
... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Pathalgaon District- Jashpur (Chhattisgarh)
... Non-applicant

MCRCA No. 1488 of 2026

- Vijay Yadav S/o Kripa Yadav Aged About 36 Years Occupation- Agriculture, Resident Of Village Kachhar, P.O. Ludeg, Tehsil Pathalgaon, District Jashpur (Chhattisgarh)
---Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Police Station- Pathalgaon, District- Jashpur (Chhattisgarh)
... Non-applicant

MCRCA No. 1490 of 2026

- Savitri Chauhan Wife Of Late Minu @ Bhinurat, Aged About 37 Years Resident Of Kachhar, Police Station - Patthalgaon, District - Jashpur (C.G.)
---Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station - Patthalgaon, District - Jashpur (C.G.)
... Non-applicant

MCRCA No. 1496 of 2026

- Deepanshu Agrawal S/o Naresh Agrawal Aged About 30 Years R/o Ludeg, P.S. Pathalgaon, Distt. Jashpur, Chhattisgarh.
---Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Pathalgaon, Distt. Jashpur, Chhattisgarh.

... Non-applicant

MCRCA No. 1505 of 2026

- Khemasagar Yadav S/o Mitrabhan Yadav Aged About 46 Years R/o Village- Kacchar, Ps- Ludeg, Tehsil- Pathalgaon, District- Jashpur (C.G.)

---Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station- Pathalgaon, District- Jashpur (C.G.)

... Non-applicant

MCRCA No. 1510 of 2026

1. Ramnivas Suryawanshi S/o Bhothnath Aged About 38 Years Occupation Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Resident Of Village Maini, Police Station Bagicha, District Jashpur C. G.
2. Sangeeta, Nag W/o Puran Singh Aged About 38 Years Occupation, Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat, Kachhar, Police Station, Patthalgaon, District Jashpur C. G.

...Applicants

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The Station House Officer, Police Station Patthalgaon, District Jashpur C. G.

... Non-applicant

For Applicants : Mr. Y.C. Sharma, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Sameer Rigri, Advocate, Mr. Vikash Kumar, Advocate, Mr. Shashi Kumar Kushwaha, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Rajendra Kumar Patel, Advocate, Mr. Sanjay Kumar Agrawal, Advocate, Mr. Ajeet Yadav, Advocate

For Respondent-State : Mr. Sumit Singh, Dy. Adv. General and Mr. Ramnarayan Sahu, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

ORDER ON BOARD

15/09/2026

1. As all these applications are arising out of same crime number, therefore, they are being heard together and disposed of by this common order.
2. Applicants have preferred these applications under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail as they apprehend their arrest in connection with Crime No. 174/2026

registered at Police Station- Pathalgaon, District Jashpur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 61(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023.

3. Krishna Kumar Yadav, applicant in MCRCA No. 1467/2026 is Patwari. Vijay Yadav, applicant in MCRCA No. 1488/2026 is witness to the sale deed executed by applicant Savitri Chauhan (applicant in MCRCA No. 1490/2026). Savitri Chauhan is wife of deceased Meenu Chauhan and allegation against whom is that she after death of her husband, has mutated the property on her name and thereafter sold it to applicants namely Deepanshu Agrawal (applicant in MCRCA No. 1496/2026) and Khemasagar Yadav (applicant in MCRCA No. 1505/2026). Sangeeta Nag is Sarpanch of village panchayat Kachhar, Patthalgaon, district Jashpur and Ramnivas Suryawanshi is Panchayat Secretary (applicants in MCRCA No. 1510/2026).
4. Case of prosecution, in brief, is that Pawan Chauhan lodged a written report in the police station Pathalgaon, district Jashpur on 13.08.2026 stating therein that applicant Savitri Chauhan was wife of Meenu Chauhan. She got herself separated from Meenu Chauhan by executing an agreement (notarized on stamp paper) on 27.06.2019 and since then Savitri Chauhan and Meenu Chauhan were residing separately. On 09.05.2026, Meenu Chauhan died. Deceased Meenu Chauhan was not having any issue nor any other siblings. Complainant is cousin brother of late Meenu Chauhan. After death of Meenu Chauhan, applicant Savitri Chauhan by giving wrong information of date of death of deceased has obtained death certificate mentioning the date of death of Meenu Chauhan as 29.05.2026 in place of 09.05.2026 and got her name mutated in the land record of the immovable property recorded in the name of late Meenu Chauhan and sold the same by executing registered sale deed dated 24.07.2026 and 25.07.2026 in favour of applicants

herein Deepanshu Agrawal and Khemasagar Yadav. The proceeding recorded by the village panchayat is forged one and based upon which the death certificate was issued and further the signature and thumb impression of Savitri Chauhan is also forge in the sale deed. Complaint was registered against applicants for the offence as mentioned above.

5. Learned counsel for the applicants would submit that the allegation levelled against applicants of preparation of forged and fabricated documents is absolutely false and baseless. They contended that if the complaint made by complainant is to be accepted on its face then also only the date of death of late Meenu Chauhan is wrongly mentioned in the death certificate as 29.05.2026 in place of 09.05.2026, which might be inadvertent error. They further contended that there was no proceedings of dissolution of marriage between applicant Savitri Chauhan and her husband late Meenu Chauhan in accordance with law. After death of Meenu Chauhan, application for mutation was filed by applicant Savitri Chauhan before the Tahsildar to pass an order of mutation and the Tahsildar has passed the order of mutation following due process of law, based upon which name of applicant Savitri Chauhan was mutated in the land record and thereafter the property was sold out. The allegations levelled against applicants are absolutely false and baseless, hence, they submitted that applications submitted by applicants for grant of anticipatory bail may be allowed.
6. Mr. Vikash Agrawal, learned counsel for applicant Vijay Yadav, applicant in MCRCA No. 1488/2026, submits that applicant has been made accused only because he is witness to the execution of sale deed executed in favour of applicant Khemasagar.
7. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the submission of counsel for applicants and would submit that according to the allegation levelled by complainant, it is apparent that name of applicant Savitri

Chauhan was mutated on the basis of forged and fabricated death certificate issued by the village panchayat. He also contended that as per allegation, applicant Savitri Chauhan, one of the accused, has separated herself from deceased Meenu Chauhan long ago in the year 2019 and was residing separately. However, suppressing this fact she had got her name mutated and sold out the entire land to other persons.

8. Upon putting query to learned State counsel, he submits that according to the documents available in record, it is appearing that complainant is cousin brother of deceased Meenu Chauhan and the deceased was not survived by any legal heir.
9. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the documents available in the application.
10. On due consideration of the entirety of the facts and circumstances of the case, submission of learned counsel for the parties, complaint appears to be arising out of the property dispute, without commenting anything on merits, I am inclined to allow these anticipatory bail applications.
11. Accordingly, applications are allowed and it is directed that in the event of arrest of applicants in connection with the crime in question (174/2026), they shall be released on anticipatory bail by the Officer arresting them on their executing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- each applicant with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned arresting Officer. Applicants shall also abide by the following conditions:
 - (i) that the applicants shall make themselves available for interrogation before the Investigation Officer as and when required;
 - (ii) that the applicants 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
 - (iii) that the applicants shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and

(iv) that the applicants shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till conclusion of the trial.

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

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
JUDGE

pwn