CGHC010340112026 2026:CGHC:44278

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 2187 of 2026

1. Manik Chandrakar S/o Ramji Chandrakar Aged About 46 Years, R/o Torla Nawapara, P.S. Kunda, District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh.

2. Parmeshwar Chandrakar S/o Ramji Chandrakar Aged About 54 Years, R/o Torla Nawapara, P.S. Kunda, District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh.

3. Raghunandan Chandrakar S/o Jaleshwar Chandrakar Aged About 29 Years, R/o Torla Nawapara P.S. Kunda, District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh.

4. Dhannu Sahu S/o Siyaram Sahu Aged About 30 Years, R/o Torla Nawapara P.S. Kunda, District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh.

CHANDRAKANT DEWANGAN

Digitally signed by CHANDRAKANT DEWANGAN
Date: 2026.10.13 17:44:58 +0530

... Appellants

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Police Station AJAK Kabirdham, District Kawardha Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Appellants	:	Mr. Bharat Sharma, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Ms. Vaishali Mahilong, Dy. Govt. Advocate.
For Complainant	:	Mr. Roshan Dubey, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Narendra Kumar Vyas

Order on Board

13/10/2026

1. The present appellant has filed the present criminal appeal under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short “the Act, 1989”) for grant

of regular bail to the appellants who have been arrested on 08/08/2026 in connection with Crime No.01/2026 registered at Police Station AJAK Kabirdham, District Kawardha (C.G.) for commission of offence under Sections 3(2)(va), 3(1)(द), 3(1)(ध) of the Act, 1989 and Sections 74, 75(2), 75(3), 76, 296, 115(2) 351(3), 333 and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 19/05/2026, the complainant lodged a written complaint alleging that the appellants had teased her and threatened to kill her. It is further alleged that the complainant, who is the present Sarpanch of the village, stated in her complaint that the accused and his wife had held the office of Sarpanch for 15 years but lost the election in the year 2025. Thereafter, they allegedly threatened and abused the complainant and others by referring to their caste. On the basis of the said complaint, an FIR was registered on 20/05/2026 at Police Station SC/ST, Kabirdham, bearing Crime No. 01/2026, for the alleged commission of offences punishable under Sections 3(2)(va), 3(1)(द) and 3(1)(ध) of the Act, 1989, and Sections 74, 75(2), 75(3), 76, 296, 115(2), 351(3), 333 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that, prior to the registration of the present FIR, the appellants had also lodged a complaint against the complainant, alleging that they had been threatened and abused by her. The said complaint was registered at the concerned Police Station on 18/05/2026, bearing Crime No. 68/2026, for the alleged commission of

offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 190, 191(2), 296 and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. He submits that the present FIR is nothing but a counter-case lodged by the complainant. He further submits that the appellants are in jail since 08/08/2026, the charge-sheet has already been filed, their custodial interrogation is no longer required, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. On these grounds, learned counsel prays for grant of bail to the appellants.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the objector submits that the present FIR is not a counterblast, but the delay in lodging the FIR occurred because the police authorities were not registering the offence. Consequently, the FIR was registered on 20/05/2026 at Police Station SC/ST, Kabirdham, bearing Crime No.01/2026. He further submits that the appellants had threatened the complainant and, therefore, prays that the bail application filed by the appellants be rejected.

5. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the appellants and submits that the appellants are involved in a heinous offence. He further submits that the appellants have criminal antecedents and that sufficient material is available on record to establish their involvement in the alleged offence. On these grounds, he prays for rejection of the bail application.

6. I have learned counsel for the parties and perused the diary with utmost satisfaction.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly that both parties have lodged FIRs against each other, the appellants are in

jail since 08/08/2026, more than two months have elapsed since their arrest, the charge-sheet has already been filed, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, this Court is of the view that the appellants are entitled to be released on bail.

8. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 14-A(2) of the Act, 1989 is allowed. It is directed that each of the appellants shall be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond for a sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court. They shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given by the said trial Court, till disposal of the trial.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Narendra Kumar Vyas)
Judge

Chandrakant