



CGHC010358262026

2026:CGHC:44497

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****CRA No. 2526 of 2026**

1 - Bhavesh Verma S/o Shriram Verma, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Near Satyanarayan Temple, P.S. Tikarapara, Distt. Raipur Chhattisgarh.

... Appellant**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. Tikarapara, Distt. Raipur Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Appellant : Mr. B.L. Dembra, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. Kalpesh Ruparel, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal**Order On Board****14/10/2026**

1. The victim of the case has appeared virtually and recorded 'no objection' in granting bail to the appellant.
2. The appeal is filed under Section 14-A (2) of the SCST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 for grant of regular bail to the appellant as he is arrested in connection with crime number 720/2025 registered at police station Tikrapara, District Raipur (C.G.) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 333, 109, 3(5) of BNS, under Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act and under Section 3 (2)(v) of the SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989.
3. The first bail of the appellant has been rejected by this Court in CRA No. 1134/2026, vide its order dated 11.05.2026.

4. By order dated 31.08.2026 passed by the Trial Court in case No.41/2025, the second bail application filed by the appellant has been rejected against which the appellant has filed this appeal.
5. In this case there are total 3 accused persons, out of which one is juvenile. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 14.09.2025, complainant Ayush Thakur lodged a report stating that on 13.09.2025 in the night at 22.30 O' clock, the appellant along with co-accused and a juvenile offender forcibly entered into his house, abused in filthy language and assaulted his brother Abhijeet Thakur. It is alleged that the co-accused Vivek Verma and the juvenile offender caught hold of his brother Abhijeet Thakur whereas the appellant Bhavesh Verma assaulted his brother with a sharp pointed object, due to which, his brother suffered injuries on his neck and other parts of body and was admitted in hospital. On the basis of the said report, crime was registered.
6. Learned Counsel appearing for the Appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He further submits that the victim has no objection in granting bail to the appellant. There are three accused persons in the present case, out of whom one is a juvenile who has already been granted bail by the learned Trial Court, while the co-accused, Vivek Verma, has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 12.08.2026 passed in CRA No. 1904/2026. He further submits that the witness to the seizure memo has not supported the alleged seizure of the knife. The appellant is in jail since 14.09.2025, out of 24 prosecution witnesses, only 16 have been examined till date and the trial is likely to take some time to be finalized, therefore, it is prayed that the appeal may be allowed and the appellant may be released on bail.
7. On the other hand, learned Counsel appearing for the State opposes the bail application and submits that there is sufficient evidence available on record against the Appellant, the knife has

been seized from him, he was the main accused and that his case is distinguishable from that of the other co-accused persons. There has been no change in the circumstances since the rejection of the appellant's first bail application, therefore, at this stage, the Appellant may not be granted bail.

8. I have heard learned Counsel appearing for the parties and perused the documents available on record.
9. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the nature and gravity of offence and the material collected and available on record against the applicant and also considering that out of total 24 witnesses only 16 have been examined till date, this Court is of the considered view that no such change in circumstances warranting grant of bail to the applicant is made out, this Court is not inclined to release the applicant on bail.
10. Accordingly, the appeal is **dismissed**.
11. However, looking to the detention period of the Appellant, the concerned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as early as possible preferably within a period of 04 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

Sd/-

(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge