



CGHC010380032026



2026:CGHC:44894

Digitally signed
by RAMESH
KUMAR VATTI
Date: 2026.10.16
17:59:32 +0530

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9321 of 2026

* - Gangadhar Chandravanshi S/o Tilak Chandravanshi Aged About 40 Years
R/o Dharampura, Police Station- Pipariya, District Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

Versus

* - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station
Pipariya, District Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Omprakash Sahu, Advocate

For Non-Applicant : Ms. Smriti Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey **Order on Board**

16/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this first bail application under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 as he is in jail since 01.07.2026 in connection with Crime No. 188/2026 registered in Police Station- Pipariya, District Kabirdham (CG) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 296, 115(2), 351(3) & 118(1) of BNS and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act.
2. As per case of prosecution, on 30.06.2026 the present applicant abused father of the complainant with filthy language and threatened to kill him. It is also alleged that the present applicant inflicted injury on

his neck using a battleaxe. F.I.R. was lodged on same date. Accordingly, the police registered the offence as stated above.

3. Mr. Omprakash Sahu, learned Advocate appearing for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent person, he has falsely been implicated in the case, charge-sheet has already been filed and he is in jail since 01.07.2026. He would contend that the applicant has 01 criminal antecedent which was registered way back in the year 2013. Thus, he would pray for grant of bail.
4. On the other hand, Ms. Smriti Shrivastava, learned Panel Lawyer appearing for the State/non-applicant would oppose. She would submit that the present applicant inflicted injury on the vital part of the complainant by means of battleaxe. She would contend that though according to MLC, nature of injury was simple, but intention of the applicant has to be seen. She would submit that the bail application of the applicant deserves to be rejected.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Having considered the fact that the applicant has stale criminal antecedent which was registered in the year 2013, he is in jail since 01.07.2026 and charge-sheet has already been filed; further injury sustained by the complainant according to MLC is simple in nature, without commenting anything on merits of the case, I am inclined to grant bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**.
7. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

I. He 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 fact to the Court;

II. He shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to a fair and expeditious trial;

III. He shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till the disposal of the trial; and,

IV. He shall not involve himself in any offence of a similar nature in future.

8. The observation made in the course of this order is only for considering the case of the applicant on the application for the grant of regular bail. The concerned trial Court shall not be influenced or bound by any observation made in the course of this order.
9. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge