CGHC010359642026 2026:CGHC:45375

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9079 of 2026

Arun Khuntel S/o Narayan Khunte Aged About 21 Years R/o Maroda, Station Nevai Police Station District Durg C.G.

... Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Utai, District Durg C.G.

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Yashpal Singh, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	:	Ms. Sameeksha Gupta, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

27.10.2026

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. 247/2026 registered at Police Station : Utai, District : Durg (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 303 (2), 111 and Section 3(5) of BNS.

2. That, as per the prosecution story, in brief, the complainant, Mr. Purushottam Jaiswal, lodged a report at Police Station Utai, District Durg, on 13.05.2026, stating that he works as a Supervisor with Jio Company. In the year 2008, a tower serving Airtel, Jio, and Idea companies was installed at Machandur on the business premises of late Durga Prasad Rajput. The said tower was installed by Indus Company and bears ID No. IN-2026942 and Jio ID No. MP-D4B4ENB-H005. It was further alleged that on 13.05.2026, between 2:00 PM and 2:30 PM, some unknown persons stole approximately 50 metres of copper cable, valued at approximately ₹20,000/-, from the Jio and Airtel towers. On the basis of the complainant's report, Police Station Utai registered Crime No. 247/2026 against the applicant/accused, Arun Khuntel, and other co-accused persons for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 303(2), 111, and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. The investigation in the matter has been completed, and a charge sheet has been filed before the competent court.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that no stolen article has been seized from the possession of the applicant. It is further submitted that the investigation is complete and the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent court. The applicant has been in judicial custody since 16.05.2026. Learned counsel fairly submits that the applicant has three criminal antecedents pertaining to the years 2022 and 2023. However, considering the

facts and circumstances of the present case, the nature of the allegations, and the fact that the charge-sheet has already been filed, learned counsel prays that the applicant be enlarged on regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the applicant has three criminal antecedents. It is further submitted that the motorcycle in question was seized from the exclusive possession of the applicant, which connects him with the alleged offence. On these grounds, learned State counsel submits that the applicant does not deserve to be released on regular bail and prays for the rejection of the bail application.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned State counsel and perused the case diary, along with the other material available on record.

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, the fact that the charge-sheet has already been filed, and the period of detention undergone by the applicant since 16.05.2026, I am of the opinion that the applicant's further detention is not necessary for the purpose of investigation. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am inclined to allow the bail application. Therefore, the applicant is entitled to be released on regular bail, subject to the conditions imposed by this Court.

7. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal

bond for a sum of **Rs. 50,000/-** to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

(a) he shall make himself available for interrogation by the police officer as and when required;

(b)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; and

(c) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to a fair and expeditious trial.

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

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Saurabh