CGHC010132082026

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 3233 of 2026

Lakhvindar Kaur Urf Lucky W/o Praveen Kumar Gupta Aged About 45 Years R/o Durga Para, Supela, Behind Junev Cooperative, Junev Rented House, Police Station Supela, District Durg Chhattisgarh

--- **Applicant(s)**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station - Vaishali Nagar, District Durg Chhattisgarh

--- **Non-applicant(s)**

For Applicant	:	Mr. Virendra Kashyap, Advocate.
For Non-applicants/State	:	Mr. Sharad Mishra, Govt. Advocate.

MCRC No. 3713 of 2026

Anand Kurrey S/o Madhu Kurrey Aged About 42 Years R/o Shakti Nagar, Khursipar Zone No. 1, Sector 11, Durg, At Present Address Kailash Nagar Ekta Chowk, Housing Board, Police Station Jamul, Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh.

---**Applicant(s)**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Of Police Station Vaishali Nagar, Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh.

--- **Non-applicant(s)**

For Applicant	:	Ms. Kanchan Kalwani, Advocate.
For Non-applicants/State	:	Mr. Sharad Mishra, Govt. Advocate.

MCRC No. 3107 of 2026

B. Keshwan Reddy @ Keshaw S/o K. Bairagi Reddy Aged About 57 Years R/o Quarter No. 18b, Street No. 01, Sector-01, Bhilai Bhatti, District- Durg (Chhattisgarh).

---**Applicant(s)**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Police Station- Vaishali Nagar, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.

...**Non-Applicant(s)**

For Applicant	:	Mr. Jitendra Gupta, Advocate.
For Non-applicants/State	:	Mr. Sharad Mishra, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri. Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

04/11/2026

1. Since the above three bail applications are arising out of same crime number, same police station and same offences so they are being heard and decided by this common order.

2. Applicant **Lakhvinder Kaur @ Lucky** and applicant **B. Keshwan Reddy @ Keshav** have preferred their respective second bail applications, whereas applicant **Anand Kurre** has preferred his first bail application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail, as they have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 265/2025, registered

at Police Station Vaishali Nagar, District Durg (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 98, 3(5) and 64 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 6 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (for short, 'the POCSO Act').

3. The earlier first bail application of applicant **Lakhvinder Kaur @ Lucky** was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court in MCRC No. 9568 of 2025 vide order dated 11.12.2025. The earlier first bail application of applicant **B. Keshwan Reddy @ Keshav** was rejected on merits by a coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC No. 8502 of 2025 vide order dated 25.11.2025. Hence, the present second bail applications filed by the said applicants.

4. The prosecution story, in brief, is that the victim lodged a written complaint at Police Station Vaishali Nagar, District Durg, alleging that, as her brother had gone to Visakhapatnam for employment, he had left her in the care of her aunt, Harjinder Kaur. It is alleged that her aunt initially induced her by offering money and thereafter, took her to the house of co-accused Sulochana Tandi at Ram Nagar on 20.05.2025, despite her unwillingness. Thereafter, co-accused Sulochana Tandi allegedly circulated the victim's photographs through her mobile phone to various persons and sent the victim to several persons in lieu of money, allegedly ranging from Rs.4,000/- to Rs.5,000/- per person. The victim was allegedly subjected to sexual exploitation by

approximately 20 to 25 persons at different places, including the house of co-accused Sulochana Tandi, Power House and hotels situated on Raipur Road. It is further alleged that the persons who were sent to the victim paid money to co-accused Harjinder Kaur and Sulochana Tandi. The victim was allegedly lured with the promise of jewellery and was also threatened that, if she disclosed the incident to anyone, she and her brother would be implicated in a false case. Due to fear and shame, she could not disclose the incident to anyone. It is further alleged that she was last sent for prostitution on 02.07.2025 for a consideration of Rs.5,000/-. Subsequently, when she went to the house of her elder aunt, she disclosed the entire incident to her, whereafter her brother was informed and the matter was reported to the police.

During investigation, the victim, in her statement, also referred to a person named “Lucky” in connection with the alleged prostitution racket. The role of applicant Lakhvinder Kaur @ Lucky surfaced during investigation and co-accused Harjinder Kaur also allegedly referred to the said person in her memorandum statement. The investigating agency has collected call detail records of mobile phone No. 74892xxxxx, allegedly belonging to co-accused Harjinder Kaur, which indicate calls and messages exchanged with mobile phone No. 76971xxxxx, allegedly belonging to applicant Lakhvinder Kaur. The mobile phones of the accused persons were also seized during investigation.

5. So far as applicant B. Keshwan Reddy @ Keshav is concerned, it is alleged that the victim, in her statement, named him as one of the persons who had established physical relations with her during the relevant period. It is further alleged that he had contacted the co-accused persons and paid money in connection with the said act. Similarly, applicant Anand Kurre is alleged to have taken the victim in his car and established physical relations with her on several occasions during the period from 20.05.2025 to 02.07.2025. On the basis of the written complaint and the material collected during investigation, the aforesaid offences were registered against the applicants and other co-accused persons. After completion of investigation, charge-sheet has been filed before the competent Court.

6. Learned counsel appearing for applicant Lakhvinder Kaur @ Lucky would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the applicant is a 45-year-old woman and the sole earning member of her family. He would further submit that the earlier bail application of the applicant was dismissed as withdrawn in MCRC No. 9568 of 2025 vide order dated 11.12.2025, without adjudication on merits and thereafter there has been a change in circumstances as the trial has commenced, but the prosecution evidence has not progressed substantially despite several opportunities. It is further submitted that no specific allegation has been made against the applicant in the FIR or the complaint and the victim

has merely referred to a person named “Lucky”, without furnishing any description or identifying particulars. Even in the statements of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, no specific identifying particulars or specific overt act have been attributed to the applicant. He would also submit that no test identification parade was conducted during investigation and the applicant was never identified by the victim in accordance with law. It is further submitted that no recovery or incriminating material has been seized from the applicant and there is no evidence of any financial transaction, message, photograph or digital material connecting her with the alleged offence. The prosecution case against the applicant is primarily based on call detail records and memorandum statements of co-accused persons, which, in the absence of any corroborative material, are insufficient to establish her involvement. It is also submitted that mere telephonic contact does not establish involvement in any criminal conspiracy. He would further submit that co-accused Nasreen has already been granted bail and the case of the present applicant stands on a better footing. The applicant has no criminal antecedents and being a woman, deserves liberal consideration. It is further submitted that the applicant has remained in custody since 10.08.2025 and the trial is likely to take considerable time for its conclusion. On these grounds, learned counsel prays for grant of bail.

7. Learned counsel appearing for applicant B. Keshwan Reddy @

Keshav would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. She would further submit that the earlier first bail application of the applicant was rejected by this Court in MCRC No. 8502 of 2025 vide order dated 25.11.2025, primarily on the basis of the statement of the victim and the gravity of the allegations. However, subsequent thereto, there has been a change in circumstances, as the charge-sheet has been filed and the trial has commenced, but the prosecution evidence has not progressed substantially. It is further submitted that the applicant is in custody since 09.08.2025 and continued incarceration would amount to pre-trial punishment. She would also submit that the prosecution case is primarily based on the statement of the victim and there is no independent corroborative evidence connecting the applicant with the alleged offence. The medical examination report does not indicate any injury or conclusive sign of forceful sexual assault. It is further submitted that no incriminating recovery has been made from the applicant and no scientific or forensic evidence has been collected to connect him with the alleged offence. The alleged transaction is also not supported by any documentary or electronic evidence, such as payment proof, call recordings or location data and further the applicant is aged about 57 years, has no criminal antecedents and further co-accused Nasreen has already been granted bail and the applicant is also entitled to the benefit of parity. It is lastly submitted that the conclusion of the trial is likely

to take considerable time. On these grounds, learned counsel prays for grant of bail.

8. Learned counsel appearing for applicant Anand Kurre would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He would further submit that the applicant has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. It is submitted that the applicant is a young person aged about 42 years and has remained in jail since 05.10.2025. The charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. On these grounds, learned counsel prays for grant of bail to the applicant.

9. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant of bail and submit that serious allegations have been levelled against all the applicants in connection with the alleged organised prostitution racket involving a minor victim. He would further submit that pursuant to the direction of this Court, the victim along with her brother appeared before this Court on 02.09.2026 and raised serious objection to the grant of bail to the applicants. It is further submitted that, in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, the victim has made specific allegations regarding her sexual exploitation and the involvement of the accused persons. Learned State counsel would also submit that on the date of the alleged incident, the victim was

aged about 17 years and 10 months and therefore, was a minor. The allegations disclose that the victim was allegedly subjected to repeated sexual exploitation by several persons for monetary consideration. He would further submit that the earlier first bail application of applicant B. Keshwan Reddy @ Keshav has already been rejected on merits by a coordinate Bench of this Court and there is no substantial change in circumstances warranting reconsideration of his prayer for bail. On these grounds, he prays for rejection of all the bail applications.

10. Pursuant to the direction of this Court, the victim along with her brother appeared before this Court through video conferencing on 02.09.2026 and raised serious objection to the grant of bail to the applicants.

11. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.

12. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of allegations levelled against the applicants and the material collected during investigation, particularly the fact that the victim was aged about 17 years and 10 months at the relevant time and was, therefore, a minor, the allegation that she was induced and exploited by the co-accused persons and was allegedly sent to several persons for sexual exploitation in lieu of monetary consideration and the specific allegations made by the victim in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the

BNSS, the allegations prima facie disclose a serious offence involving the sexual exploitation of a minor. The allegations are not confined to a single incident but relate to repeated acts of sexual exploitation over a period of time at different places and by several persons.

13. So far as applicant Lakhvinder Kaur @ Lucky is concerned, although learned counsel has submitted that no specific overt act has been attributed to her and that her implication is based on the reference to a person named “Lucky” and the call detail records but the material collected during investigation, including the statement of the victim, the memorandum statement of co-accused Harjinder Kaur and the call detail records indicating communication between the mobile numbers allegedly belonging to co-accused Harjinder Kaur and the applicant, cannot be altogether ignored at this stage. The evidentiary value and effect of such material would be examined during trial. The fact that the earlier bail application was dismissed as withdrawn does not, by itself, entitle the applicant to bail, particularly when the allegations and the material collected during investigation disclose her alleged connection with the other accused persons. The grounds relating to absence of a test identification parade, lack of recovery and the alleged absence of direct evidence are matters which would require consideration during trial.

14. So far as applicant B. Keshwan Reddy @ Keshav is concerned,

the victim has allegedly named him as one of the persons who had subjected her to sexual exploitation during the relevant period. The earlier bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits by a coordinate Bench of this Court in MCRC No. 8502 of 2025 vide order dated 25.11.2025. Although learned counsel has referred to the commencement of trial, filing of the charge-sheet and the period of incarceration, no such substantial change in circumstances has been brought to the notice of this Court which would warrant taking a different view from the one taken by the coordinate Bench. The grounds regarding absence of medical injury, lack of recovery and absence of independent corroboration cannot, at this stage, outweigh the specific allegations made by the victim.

15. So far as applicant Anand Kurre is concerned, the specific allegation against him is that he had taken the victim in his car and established physical relations with her on several occasions during the period from 20.05.2025 to 02.07.2025. Considering the age of the victim and the nature of allegations, the fact that the applicant is in custody since 05.10.2025 and that the charge-sheet has been filed would not, by themselves, constitute sufficient grounds for his release on bail at this stage.

16. This Court has also taken note of the objection raised by the victim, who appeared before this Court along with her brother through video conferencing on 02.09.2026 and strongly opposed

the release of the applicants on bail. The allegations, the nature of the material collected during investigation and the overall circumstances of the case do not persuade this Court to enlarge the applicants on bail at this stage.

17. Consequently, all the three bail applications, namely, the second bail applications filed by applicants Lakhvinder Kaur @ Lucky and B. Keshwan Reddy @ Keshav, and the first bail application filed by applicant Anand Kurrey, are hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Kunal