CGHC010365082026 2026:CGHC:44202

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8753 of 2026

Tekram Sahu Son Of Shri Ganesh Sahu Aged About 20 Years Resident of House No. 144, Ward No. 09, Kabir Chowk Para, Village - Aandu, Post And Thana - Berla, Tahsil - Berla, District - Bemetara (Chhattisgarh).

--- **Applicant**

versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station - Khursipar, Bhilai, District - Durg (Chhattisgarh) (Wrongly Mentioned As Police Station - Bemetra In The Cause Title). --- **Non-applicant**

For Applicant	**:**	Ms. Pragati Pandey, Advocate
For Non-applicant/State	**:**	Ms. Monika Thakur, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

13/10/2026

1. This is the first bail application filed by the applicant under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) for grant of regular bail. The applicant is in custody in connection with Crime No. 380/2026, registered at Police Station – Khursipar, Bhilai, District Durg (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Section 69 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that a report was lodged by the prosecutrix stating that she is a widow living in a rented

accommodation and employed in a private job. For the past one and a half years, the applicant was residing with her in the same room in a live-in relationship on the promise of marriage, during the said period physical relations were established between them. On 14.08.2026, when she insisted that the applicant disclose their relationship to his family and solemnize the marriage, he refused to marry her, thereafter report was lodged.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present crime. It is submitted that the relationship between the applicant and the victim was purely consensual and they lived together in a live-in relationship for over 1.5 years. It is further submitted that the applicant has not yet attained the legally marriageable age of 21 years, therefore, he refused to marry the victim and subsequently FIR was lodged. The applicant has no criminal antecedents, has been in custody since 31.08.2026, and the trial is likely to take time to conclude; therefore, he may be enlarged on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the bail application and submitted that the applicant established physical relations with the victim on the false promise of marriage and later reneged on his promise; thus, he may not be enlarged on bail.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.

6. Having considered the rival submissions, and taking into account the fact that both the applicant and the victim were majors at the time of the incident; they were cohabiting in a live-in relationship for about one and a half years; the applicant has no criminal antecedents and has been in custody since 31.08.2026, without commenting on the merits of the case, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant. 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.

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

Nadim