SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Digitally signed by SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Date: 2026.10.06 14:04:47 +0530

CGHC010334062026 2026:CGHC:43152

**NAFR**

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**MCRC No. 8228 of 2026**

1. Sunil Sahu S/o Ramcharan Sahu Aged About 25 Years R/o Village- Deori, Police Station- Rajim, District- Gariyaband (C.G.)
2. Akshay Kumar Sahu S/o Ishwari Ram Sahu Aged About 22 Years R/o Village- Deori, Police Station- Rajim, District- Gariyaband (C.G.)

**... Applicants**

**versus**

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station- Rajim, District- Gariyaband, (C.G.)

**... Non-Applicant**

---

For Applicants : Mr. Shivendu Pandya, Advocate
For State : Mr. Keshav Gupta, Government Advocate

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey**

**Order on Board**

**06.10.2026**

1. This is the second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicants who have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 414/2025 registered at Police Station Rajim, District Gariyaband (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 296, 115(2), 351(3), 332(a), 332(b), 190, 191(2) and 191(3) of BNS.

2. Earlier, first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 7267 of 2026 was rejected vide order dated 10.08.2026 as defaults were not rectified within given time.

3. As per the case of the prosecution, present applicants along with 09 other co-accused, committed the murder of Hiteshwar Tarak on 28.12.2025 at about 11:00 p.m. at Village Deori, Police Station Rajim. Merg intimation was lodged by father of the deceased Gopiram Tarak, and subsequently, an FIR was registered for the aforesaid offence against 11 accused persons.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants would argue that the present applicants have falsely been implicated. They did not assault the deceased and no weapon was seized on their instance, charge-sheet has already been filed and applicants are in jail since 29.12.2025. Thus, he would pray for grant of bail to the present applicants.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State would oppose the submissions advanced by Mr. Pandya. Mr. Keshav Gupta, Government Advocate would contend that FIR was lodged by father of the deceased, who had witnessed the incident. He would submit that father of the deceased, Gopiram, in his statement recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, has categorically stated that the present applicants and other co-accused, in furtherance of common object, assaulted the deceased using an axe, wooden club, piece of stone, hands and fists. He would submit that a piece of stone was seized on instance of the present applicants and FSL report is positive. He would further submit that bail applications of two other co-accused have been rejected by the Coordinate Bench. Thus, he would contend that the present applications deserve to be rejected.

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

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and

gravity of allegations made against the present applicants, statement of Gopiram (father of the deceased), FSL report of stone seized on instance of the applicants, manner in which offence was committed and the fact that bail applications of two co-accused have already been rejected, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicants.

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

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

$iddhant