CGHC010300442026 2026:CGHC:43845

**NAFR**

Digitally signed by RAMESH KUMAR VATTI
Date: 2026.10.15 19:54:23 +0530

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**MCRC No. 7550 of 2026**

*** -** Saugat @ Sonu Rao S/o Ashok Rao Aged About 21 Years R/o Village Datrengi, Near Mahamaya, Thana, Bhatapara (Village) District Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C. G.)

**... Applicant**

**Versus**

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

**... Non-Applicant**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For Applicant | : | Mr. Deepak Jain, Advocate |
| For Non-Applicant | : | Ms. Monika Thakur, Panel Lawyer |

**Hon’ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey**
**Order on Board**

**09/10/2026**

1. The applicant has preferred this second bail application under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 as he is in jail since 24.02.2026 in connection with Crime No. 97/2026 registered at Police Station Bhatapara (Village), District Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.), for commission of offence punishable under Sections 137(2), 87 & 64 of BNS and Sections 4 & 6 of POCSO Act.

2. Earlier bail application of the present applicant was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 17.06.2026 in MCRC No. 4766/2026.

3. As per prosecution story, the grandfather of the victim lodged a missing report at Police Station Bhatapara (Village), District Balodabazar-Bhatapara to the effect that his niece aged about 16 years, 10 months, was missing since 21.02.2026 at about 03:00 pm. During course of

investigation, police recovered the victim from company of the present applicant on 23.02.2026. The victim was medically examined on basis of her statement. Subsequently, police registered the offences as stated above against the applicant.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the case. He would contend that charge-sheet has already been filed, the applicant is in jail from 24.02.2026 and some of the witnesses have already been examined, thus, he would pray for grant of bail to the applicant.

5. On the other hand, learned Panel Lawyer appearing for the State would oppose the bail application.

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

7. Victim along with her father appeared through video conferencing from DLSA, Balodabazar-Bhatapara and she has raised serious objection in grant of bail to the applicant.

8. From perusal of the deposition of the victim, it is quite vivid that she has supported the case of prosecution. In her evidence, she has made specific allegation against the applicant with regard to sexual assault. As per contents of F.I.R. and documents annexed in the case diary, she was aged about 17 years on the date of incident.

9. Having considered the evidence of the victim wherein she has supported the prosecution case and she made specific allegation with regard to sexual assault against the present applicant; further looking to the age of the victim and manner in which the offence has been

committed, I am not inclined to release the applicant on regular bail. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected**.

Sd/-
**(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)**
**Judge**

vatti