SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Digitally signed by SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Date: 2026.10.28 10:20:19 +0530

CGHC010277232026 2026:CGHC:45253

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 6707 of 2026

- Suraj Devar S/o Munna Devar Aged About 24 Years R/o Rickshaw Colony Shaheed Veer Narayan Singh Ward Bhatapara P.S. Bhatapra Gramin District Balodabazar Bhatapara C.G.

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Bhatapara District Balodabazar Bhatapara C.G.

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. B.L. Sahu, Advocate
For State : Mr. Vivek Sharma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

27.10.2026

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. 540/2025 registered at Police Station Bhatapara(Village), District Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 137(2), 87, 65 of BNS and Sections 4 & 6 of POCSO Act.

2. As per case of prosecution, the complainant/mother of the victim, lodged a report alleging that her daughter/victim had left the house without informing her parents and had not returned home. Despite the passage of time, her whereabouts remained unknown, and no information with regard to her

whereabouts could be obtained by the complainant or her family members. On such complaint, the police registered a case against an unknown person. Subsequently, upon recovery of the victim, aforesaid offences were registered against the present applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is contended that the applicant and victim were in relationship with each other. He would further submit that the victim had left her parental home of her own volition. He further submits that the applicant is in jail since 05.09.2025 and he has no criminal antecedents, and trial is likely to take some time to conclude. Thus, he would pray for grant of bail to the present applicant.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail application and submit that on the date of incident, age of the victim was 16 years and there are serious allegations with regard to sexual assault in statement of victim recorded under Section 183 of BNSS. He would contend that victim has already been examined before the learned Trial Court and she has supported the case of prosecution. He would submit that instant application deserves to be rejected.

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

6. Having considered the nature and gravity of the allegations and the material available on record, and the fact that on the date of incident, the victim was aged about 16 years, she has already been examined before the learned Trial Court and has supported the case of prosecution, wherein she has categorically stated that the present applicant sexually exploited her on

pretext of marriage. She has further stated that the applicant threatened to defame her in the village.

7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the allegations made against the present applicant in statement of victim recorded under Section 183 of BNSS, testimony of the victim before the learned Trial Court and age of the victim, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant.

8. Accordingly, instant bail application is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant