CGHC010251182026 2026:CGHC:43885

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 6028 of 2026

Yogesh Yadav S/o Kailash Yadav Aged About 30 Years R/o Village- Sasauli Chhiropara, Police Station- Lundra, District Surguja C.G.

... Applicant (s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station- Lundra, District Surguja C.G.

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Ms. Poulami Das, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Amit Verma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

Order On Board

09/10/2026

1. Applicant has filed this bail application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No.80 of 2026 registered at Police Station -Lundra, District- Surguja (CG) for the offence punishable under Sections 78, 79, 351 (3), 356 (2) of BNS, 376 of IPC and Sections 4 & 6 of POCSO Act.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 18.04.2026, victim lodged a written complaint alleging that the applicant captured a photograph with

Digitally signed by PRAVEEN KUMAR SINHA
Date: 2026.10.12 11:13:45 +0530

her and threatened her to marry her. It is further alleged that the marriage of the prosecutrix was fixed with another person, whom the applicant showed the alleged photograph and got the marriage proposal of the victim broken. It is also the case of the prosecution that the applicant and the victim were acquainted with each other since the year 2019 and applicant established physical relations with the victim on the pretext of marriage and thereafter continued the relationship. Applicant also threatened the victim and prevented her from marrying elsewhere. On the basis of the report lodged, aforementioned crime was registered and the applicant was arrested.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant has been falsely implicated in the crime. He has not committed any such offence. Victim was aged about 23 years of age on the date of complaint and only to implicate the applicant in heinous offence allegation has been levelled that physical relations have been established by the applicant with victim when she was minor. She submits that investigation is complete and charge sheet has been filed, trial may take some time, hence, applicant may be extended benefit of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the submission of learned counsel for the applicant and submits that in the report there is also mention that only to mount pressure upon complainant/victim to marry her, applicant climbed on the tower and was shouting and pressurizing parents of victim to get their daughter married with him. He also submits that when marriage of victim has settled with some other person, applicant went to house of that person and by showing photographs, had stated that he is going to marry her and on

that ground marriage of the victim settled with other person has been broken.

5. Pursuant to notice issued, victim appeared before this Court virtually and raised objection in grant of bail to applicant.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, submission of learned counsel for the respective parties, nature of allegation, I do not find present to be a fit case to grant bail to the applicant.

8. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Praveen