SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Digitally signed by SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Date: 2026.10.06 18:04:43 +0530

CGHC010333612026 2026:CGHC:43176

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8252 of 2026

- Siyachand Vaishya S/o Late Ramkeval Vaishya Aged About 43 Years R/o Village Bhaukhand Khajuri Tola, Police Station - Mada, District- Singrauli (M.P.)

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The Station House Officer, Police Station Raghunathnagar District- Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Kakpesh Ruparel, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Dy. Advocate General
For Objector	:	Mr. Sachin Nidhi, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

06.10.2026

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. 199/2025 registered at Police Station Raghunathnagar, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 103, 238, 311 of BNS and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act.

2. As per case of prosecution, dead-body of deceased Shivraj Singh was recovered on 30.08.2025 at around 5:30 pm. Merg-intimation was lodged at concerned police station, resultantly, an FIR was registered for commission

of offence under Section 103 of BNS against the unknown person. During course of investigation, the police took the present applicant in custody and on his instance recovered knife, which was allegedly used for commission of crime, motorcycle of deceased and Rs. 50,000/- cash. The applicant herein confessed commission of crime.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would argue that applicant was implicated in commission of offence on the basis of CCTV footage, but the said material is not a part of the charge-sheet. He would further submit that motorcycle of deceased was recovered from place of incident, whereas, knife does not contain bloodstain and there is no material evidence against the present applicant and he has been arrested on suspicion. He would pray to allow this application.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State would oppose. Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Dy. Advocate General would submit that deceased was seen in the company of the present applicant on 30.08.2025 and this fact is evident from CCTV footage. He would further contend that on instance of the applicant, Rs. 50,000/- cash, knife used for commission of the offence and the motorcycle of the deceased were seized. He would submit that there is sufficient material available in the charge-sheet against the present applicant, therefore, this application deserves to be rejected.

5. Mr. Sachin Nidhi, Advocate appearing for the Objector would submit that eyewitness PW/4 Devi Sharan has already been examined and he has supported the case of prosecution. It is also contended that certificate under Section 65B of Indian Evidence Act with regard to validity of CCTV footage was issued by the competent authority. He would submit that this application

deserves to be rejected.

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

7. Having considered the fact that the applicant was seen in the company of the deceased prior to recovery of dead body, on instance of the applicant, a knife, motorcycle of the deceased and Rs. 50,000/- were recovered and eyewitness, who has been examined has supported the case of prosecution, and the manner in which the offence was committed, I am not inclined to allow this application.

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

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant