



CGHC010388462026



2026:CGHC:44892

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9315 of 2026

Saraswati Bai W/o - Late Mangal Prasad Soni Aged About 73 Years R/o -
Killa Mandir Road Maithil Para, Ward No. 32 Khairagarh P.S. City Kotwali
Durg District Durg (C.G.) **... Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. Civil Line Raipur District Raipur (C.G.)
... Respondent

For Applicant : Shri F.S.Khare, Advocate.

For Respondent/State : Shri Kanwaljeet Singh Saini, Deputy G.A.

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAKESH MOHAN PANDEY)

Order on Board

16/10/2026

1. This is the **First bail application** filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.401/2026 registered at Police Station Civil Lines Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 238, 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (for short, the BNS, 2023).
2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 27.07.2026, an F.I.R. was lodged against the present applicant and co-accused Sunita Devi Rajput for commission of offence, as stated above. In the F.I.R., the

allegations made against the applicant is that the applicant is owner of the property and was having Rin Pustika No.3975567 and furnished bail and bond in Special Criminal Case No. 183/2025 and subsequently, he moved the page where signature of the Presiding Officer was affixed and again submitted her Rin Pustika for furnishing bail in connection with Special Criminal Case No. 543/2025. It is also alleged that Rin Pustika of co-accused was also found forged. On such complaint, the offence, as stated above, was registered against the present applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would contend that the applicant has no criminal antecedents; she is a lady aged about 73 years; charge-sheet has already been filed and she is in jail since 28.07.2026 and conclusion of the trial is likely to take some considerable time. Therefore, he would pray that the bail application may be allowed and the applicant may be enlarged on bail.
4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant. He would contend that the present applicant herein knowingly well, fraudulently used a document, which was forged one, therefore, the bail application deserves to be rejected.
5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Having considered the age of the applicant, i.e., 73 years; charge-sheet has already been filed; the applicant is in jail since 28.07.2026; she has no criminal antecedents and conclusion of trial may take some

considerable time, without making any observation on merits of the matter, I am inclined to grant bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the instant bail application is **allowed**.

7. It is directed that the applicant shall be released on bail on his furnishing a **personal bond** in sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the Court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) she 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 from disclosing such fact to the Court;

(ii) she shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, &

(iii) she shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

8. The observation made herein above is for the purpose of deciding this bail application only and the trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)

JUDGE