CGHC010353232026

NAFR

HARNEET KAUR
Digitally signed by HARNEET KAUR
Date: 2026.10.15 11:24:51 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8428 of 2026

1 - Arun Pannalal S/o Late Hainri Raibert Pannalal Aged About 76 Years R/o House No.1, Nilanchal Vihar, Shankar Nagar Raipur, Police Station- Civil Lines, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

… Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station- Civil Lines, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	**:**	Ms. Fouzia Mirza, Senior Advocate with Mr. Navin Shukla, Advocate
For Non-applicant /State	**:**	Mr. Sourabh Sahu, P.L.

Hon’ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

14/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this first bail application 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. 415/2026 registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 196, 299, 353(2) of BNS and Section 67 of the IT Act.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 07/08/2026, Amit Chimnani lodged a written complaint before the Station House Officer, Police Station – Civil Lines, Raipur to the effect that one Hansraj Goyal made a certain objectionable post against hindu deities from his facebook account in which the present applicant also made an indecent comment. On such complaint, Police registered the aforesaid offence against the applicant.

3. Ms. Fouzia Mirza, learned senior counsel appearing for the applicant, would submit that applicant is a senior citizen aged about 76 years and due to mistake, he made an indecent comment from his facebook account on a post which was originally posted by one Hansraj Goyal and subsequently, the said comment was also deleted. She would further contend that the charge-sheet has already been filed and the applicant has been in judicial custody since 08/08/2026, and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. With regard to criminal antecedents, she would submit that earlier on two occasions, certain comments were made by the present applicant from his facebook and youtube accounts wherein the applicant was granted anticipatory bail in one case and an interim order was

passed in favour of the applicant in the other case. Thus, she would pray for grant of bail to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Sourabh Sahu, learned counsel appearing for the non-applicant/State, would oppose the bail application and submit that applicant has two previous criminal antecedents of similar nature and there is sufficient material on record against the present applicant to the effect that a derogatory and indecent comment was posted by the applicant from his facebook account, thus, the applicant is not entitled for grant of bail.

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

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, the old age of the applicant and though there are two criminal antecedents of the applicant of similar nature but considering that he has been granted anticipatory bail in one case and an interim order has been passed in his favour in the other case, further looking to the fact that investigation has been completed, charge-sheet has been filed and the applicant is in judicial custody since 08/08/2026, and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, without commenting on the merits of the matter, this Court is inclined to enlarge the applicant on regular bail. Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**.

7. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond for a sum of **Rs.50,000/-** with one surety in the like sum to

the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail, on following conditions :-

(i) he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such fact to the Court,

(ii) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, and

(iii) he shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

8. The observation made hereinabove is for the purpose of deciding this bail application only, the trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)

JUDGE

Harneet