CGHC010345962026

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8610 of 2026

Sunil Kumar Verma S/o Melaram Verma Aged About 35 Years R/o Pendri, Thana Pamgarh, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

... Applicant(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station-Pamgarh, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sahu, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/State	:	Mr. Sourabh Sahu, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Mr. Rakesh Mohan Pandey, Judge

Order on Board

02/11/2026

1. This is the first bail application filed by the applicant under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 192/2026 registered at Police Station Pamgarh, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.), for the offences punishable under Sections 332(b), 65(1) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 4(2) of the POCSO Act, 2012.

2. The prosecution story, in brief, is that on 07.05.2026, the applicant allegedly entered the house of the victim, who was below 16 years of age, with an intention to commit rape. It is further alleged that the applicant committed penetrative sexual assault upon the victim against her will and thereafter threatened her with dire consequences, including threat to kill her. On the basis of the report lodged by the victim/complainant, the aforesaid offence was registered against the applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He would further submit that the applicant had visited the house of the victim's family only for the purpose of demanding repayment of money which was due to him, as his mother had earlier advanced a loan to the victim's mother. He would contend that, due to the dispute regarding repayment of the said amount and previous enmity, the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He would further submit that the investigation is complete and the charge-sheet has already been filed. The charges have also been framed and the matter is now fixed for recording of prosecution evidence. He would further submit that the applicant has no criminal antecedents and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Therefore, he prays for grant of regular bail to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the prayer for grant of bail and submit that the victim, in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has levelled specific allegations of sexual assault against the present

applicant. She would further submit that, on the date of the incident, the victim was a minor aged about 12 years and 6 months. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

5. Pursuant to the order dated 29.09.2026, the victim along with her father appeared before this Court through video conferencing and raised serious objection to the grant of bail to the applicant.

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

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offence alleged against the applicant and further considering that, on the date of the incident, the victim was a minor aged about 12 years and 6 months and further the victim, in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has levelled allegations of sexual assault against the present applicant moreover, the victim, along with her father, appeared before this Court through video conferencing and raised serious objection to the grant of bail to the applicant, thus, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the applicant on regular bail.

8. Accordingly, the bail application filed by the applicant is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Kunal.