CGHC010275592026 2026:CGHC:44373

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 1752 of 2026

Kanha Chauhan S/o Harish Chauhan Aged About 25 Years R/o Turkapara, Raigarh P.S. City Kotwali Raigarh, Tahsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

--- **Appellant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Thana In-Charge City Kotwali, District Raigarh (C.G.) --- **Respondent**

Digitally signed by ALLENA ANJANI KUMAR
Date: 2026.10.15 11:10:11 +0530

CRA No. 1981 of 2026

1 - Yashwant Sarthi S/o Bharat Lal Sarthi Aged About 26 Years R/o Bhagwangudi Road, Raigarh PS- City Kotwali, District- Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

2 - Shekh Mohammad Aftab S/o Shekh Mohammad Afsar Aged About 20 Years R/o Turkapara, Chandni Chowk, Raigarh, PS- City Kotwali, District- Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

3 - Meet Verma S/o Sitesh Verma Aged About 21 Years R/o Palace Road, Turkapara, Chandni Chowk, PS- City Kotwali, District- Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

4 - Shankar Sahu S/o Vikram Sahu Aged About 21 Years R/o Nayaganj, Itwari Bazar, Raigarh PS- City Kotwali, District- Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

5 - Rohan Yadav S/o Gopal Yadav Aged About 24 Years R/o Purana Badpara, Raigarh, PS- City Kotwali, District- Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

---**Appellants**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through District Magistrate, District Raigarh (C.G.)

--- **Respondent**

CRA No. 1871 of 2026

Sameer Khan S/o Shabbir Khan, Aged About 19 Years R/o Nayaganj, Turkapara, Chandni Chowk, P S - City Kotwali, District - Raigarh (Chhattisgarh) ---**Appellant**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through District Magistrate, District Raigarh (C.G.)

--- **Respondent**

CRA No. 1864 of 2026

Raj Kewat S/o Sitaram Kewat Aged About 24 Years R/o Turkapara Chandani Chowk P.S. City Kotwali Raigarh Tahsil And District- Raigarh (C.G) (Correctly Mentioned And Kewat Is All Known As Nishad) ---**Appellant**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Thana In-Charge City Kotwali, District- Raigarh (C.G.) --- **Respondent**

For Appellants in CRA.Nos.1752/2026 & 1864/2026.	:	Shri Rajendra Tripathi Advocate
For Appellants in CRA.Nos.1871/2026 & 1981/2026.	:	Shri Ashutosh Mishra, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Dharmesh Shrivastava, Deputy Advocate General

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAKESH MOHAN PANDEY)

Order on Board

14/10/2026

1. Since all the above Criminal Appeals arise out of same Crime No.211/2026 registered at City Kotwali, District Raigarh (C.G.), they are being heard together and disposed of by this common order.
2. The instant criminal appeals filed by the respective appellants under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, the Act, 1989) are for

grant of regular bail to him, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.211/2026 registered at Police Station – City Kotwali, Raigarh, District Raigarh (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Section 190, 191(2), 191(3), 296, 351(2), 115(2), 109(1) of the Bhartiya Nyay Samhita, 2023 (for short, the BNS) and Section 3(2)(va) of the Act, 1989.

3. Case of the prosecution, in short, is that a written report was lodged by the complainant – Chaahat Jain in police station City Kotwali, Raigarh to the effect that on 21.04.2026 he along with his friends, namely, Shivam Baghel, Sagar Baghel, Sumit Das Mahant, Rishabh Chouhan and others had gone to attend the marriage function situate at Dewangan Dharmashala, Koshtapara and at 01:00 pm (22.04.2026) they were returning to their respective homes and whey they reached at Marine Drive, they found a vehicle stood on the main road, to which, the complainant asked the driver to keep aside the same, which was refused. Later on, the appellants abused the complainant party and in furtherance of their common intention, held the complainant and assaulted him, on seeing the same, the remaining friends tried to intercept them, but the appellants party also assaulted them, resultantly, the complainant party sustained injuries. On the basis report, the police registered F.I.R. on 22.04.2026 for commission of offence punishable under the aforesaid sections against the appellants.

4. By orders dated 04.07.2026, 13,07.2026 and 15.07.2026 passed by the learned Special Judge in Crime No.211/2026, the bail applications filed by the appellants have been rejected against which the appellants have filed the said appeals.

5. Learned counsel for the appellants would argue that the appellants have been falsely implicated in the case; charge-sheet has already been filed; the appellants are in jail since 22.04.2026; injuries sustained by the injured persons are simple in nature and the crime was not committed with intention that some injured/victims are belonging to SC/ST category. It is also contended that the appellants have no criminal antecedents and the trial is likely to take some time for its conclusion. They would pray that the instant appeals may be allowed and the appellants may be enlarged on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail. He would submit that one Shivam Baghel sustained grievous injuries whereas according to MLC report, the other injured persons sustained simple injuries over various parties of their bodies, therefore, this appeals deserve to be rejected.

7. On 01.09.2026, the complainant appeared through video conferencing and raised serious objection in granting bail to the appellants.

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

9. Having considered the fact that the charge-sheet has already been filed; appellants are in jail since 22.04.2026; trial is likely to take some time for its conclusion; the injury sustained by Shivam Baghel is grievous in nature, but there is no opinion of the concerned Medical Officer that the said injury is likely to cause endanger his life and also considering the fact that the injuries sustained by the other victims/injured persons are simple in nature and that one of the co-accused persons, namely, Sheikh Mohammad Junaid was already

granted bail in CRA No.1394/2026 passed on 03/07/2026, I am inclined to grant bail to the appellants. Accordingly, the instant appeal is **allowed.**

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

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

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

11. 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

Anjani