



CGHC010362112026

2026:CGHC:40918



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1541 of 2026

**1 - Ravi Sonkar S/o Late Gangaram Sonkar Aged About 57 Years R/o -
Ramkund P. S. - Azad Chowk District - Raipur (C.G.)**

... Applicant

versus

**1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station - Azad Chowk District -
Raipur (C.G.)**

... Respondent

(Cause title is taken from CIS)

For Applicant	: Ms. Madhunisha Singh, Advocate
For State/Respondent	: Mr. Aman Tamrakar, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Order on Board

18/09/2026

- Applicant has preferred this application under Section 482 of
Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory
bail as he apprehends his arrest in connection with Crime No.
42/2026 registered at Police Station- Azad Chowk, District Raipur
(C.G.) for offence punishable under Sections 308(5), 296, 111,

351(3), 127(8), 115(2), 117(2), 61, 140(1), 310(2) of BNS and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that is that between 16.02.2026 and 19.02.2026, the applicant, along with other co-accused persons, allegedly formed an unlawful assembly with the common motive of kidnapping the complainants, Jeevan Yadav and Rakesh Sharma, extorting money from them, and assaulting them. It is alleged that the accused persons, armed with deadly weapons including a pistol, magazine and sticks, trespassed into the premises at Ghorai Talab, Ramkund, Raipur, created a riot by using force and violence, abused the complainants in obscene language referring to their mother and sister, and attempted to kill them with the intention of creating terror. On the basis of these allegations, the present crime came to be registered against the applicant and the other co-accused persons. Hence, the anticipatory bail application.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the crime in question only on the basis of memorandum statement of co-accused. She also contended that the applicant has been examined before the trial Court as PW-2/Jeevan Yadu who has not supported the case of prosecution as he stated that he could not identify the persons who have committed the offence and stated that they were to be unknown persons. She also submits that eye witness has also

been examined as PW-1/Rakesh Sharma who also had not supported the case of prosecution, therefore, the allegations made by the co-accused against the applicant is absolutely false and baseless. There is no other criminal antecedent registered against the applicant. She also submitted that out of 9 accused persons, 8 accused persons have been enlarged on bail. Hence, he may be enlarged on bail.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the submission of learned counsel for applicant and submits that during the investigation proceedings one of co-accused Shaheed was arrested and from his possession one Sonata Wrist Watch was seized and at the time of identifying the seized article, the complainant has specifically named the applicant who has snatched the wrist watch. He further submits that the persons who have been enlarged on bail were enlarged on regular bail. Applicant remained absconding. He further contended that the deposition of the witnesses PW-1/Rakesh Sharma & PW-2/Jeewan Yadu (complainant) is subject matter of appreciation by the trial Court.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the documents enclosed along with bail application.
6. On due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation, submission of learned counsel for the parties, without commenting anything on merits, I am inclined to allow this anticipatory bail application.

7. Accordingly, application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of arrest of applicant in connection with the crime in question (42/2026), he shall be released on anticipatory bail by the Officer arresting him on his executing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned arresting Officer. Applicant shall also abide by the following conditions:

- (i) that the applicant shall make himself available for interrogation before the Investigation Officer as and when required;
- (ii) that the applicant 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 applicant shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and
- (iv) that the applicant shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

8. 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