Digitally signed by AJINKYA PANSARE
Date: 2026.10.05 14:17:03 +0530

CGHC010331632026 2026:CGHC:42952

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 7964 of 2026

- Sourabh Prajapati S/o Tarkeshwar Prajapati Aged About 24 Years R/o Village Argoti Police Chowki Kunni P.S. Lakhanpur, Distt- Sarguja (C.G.)

--- **Applicant**

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Gandhinagar, Distt- Sarguja (C.G.)

--- **Non-applicant**

WITH

MCRC No. 8899 of 2026

- Ranjeet Gupta S/o Kedar Prasad Gupta Aged About 40 Years R/o Village Lodhima, Ahead Sandbar Mandir, Police Station Manipur, Tahsil Ambikapur, District Sarguja Chhattisgarh

---**Applicant**

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Of Police Station Gandhinagar, District Sarguja Chhattisgarh

--- **Non-applicant**

For Applicants	:	Mr. Sanjay Agrawal, Advocate **(in MCRC No. 7964 of 2026)** Mr. Jeet Ram Patel, Advocate **(in MCRC No. 8899 of 2026)**
For Non-Applicant	:	Dr. Saurabh Pande, Dy.A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

05.10.2026

1. These are the first bail applications filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicants who have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 480/2026 registered at Police Station Gandhinagar, District : Sarguja (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 308(2), 318(4), 319(2), 62 and 61(2) of BNS, 2023.

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the present applicants, along with a co-accused, contacted the local District Excise Officer posing as Anti-Corruption Bureau (ACB) officials and demanded bottles of liquor along with cash. Consequently, the said officer lodged an FIR, pursuant to which applicant Sourabh Prajapati was arrested. In the course of the subsequent investigation, the other co-accused persons were also arrested.

3. Learned Counsel appearing for the respective applicants submit that the present applicants have falsely been implicated in this case. They further submit that applicants have no criminal antecedents, they are in jail since 27.07.2026 and conclusion of the trial is likely to take quite long time, therefore they pray for grant of regular bail to the applicants.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application and submits that following an attempt to extort a public servant and the subsequent lodging of the FIR, applicant

Saurabh Prajapati was arrested on the strength of call detail records, upon whose disclosure the other co-accused were implicated. He further submits that given the direct evidence available against the applicants in the case diary, they are not entitled to the grant of regular bail.

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

6. It is contended by the learned State counsel that there is direct evidence against the present applicants. However, it is well-settled principle of law that Court's role at the bail stage is confined to verifying the existence of prima-facie case and Courts are precluded from undertaking a detailed examination of evidence that touch upon the merits of the case.

7. Taking into consideration the aforesaid discussion coupled with the fact that the applicants have no live criminal antecedents and they are in jail since 27.07.2026, conclusion of the trial may take some more time, this Court is of the view that the applicants are entitled to be released on bail in this case.

8. It is directed that in the event of the applicants executing a personal bond for a sum of **Rs. 50,000/-** to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, they shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

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

(b)they 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) they 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

A j i n k y a