CGHC010360662026 2026:CGHC:45306

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8629 of 2026

Sanjay Yadav S/o Lalluram Yadav Aged About 37 Years R/o Village Jhafal, P.S Lalpur, District Mungeli (Chhattisgarh). --- **applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station- Lalpur District- Mungeli (Chhattisgarh) (Wrongly Mentioned As P.S Lormi, District Mungeli In The Impugned Order). --- **Non-Applicant**

MCRC No. 9587 of 2026

Ranjit Singh Rajput S/o Barelal Rajput Aged About 55 Years R/o Jhaphal Thana Lalpur, Distt- Mungeli (C.G.). ---**applicant**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through S.H.O. P.S. Lalpur, Teh. Lormi, Distt- Mungeli (C.G.). --- **Non-Applicant**

MCRC No. 9535 of 2026

Devraj @ Daddu @ Devkumar Sahu S/o Ram Ramsahai Sahu Aged About 23 Years R/o Jhajhpuri Kala, Police Station Lormi Distt. Mungeli Chhattisgarh ---**applicant**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Lalpur Distt. Mungeli Chhattisgarh. --- **Non-Applicant**

MCRC No. 9521 of 2026

Shrawan Goir S/o Shyam Goir Aged About 18 Years R/o Jawahar Ward Mungeli Tehsil And District Mungeli Chhattisgarh. ---**Applicant**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Station House Officer, Police Station Lalpur District Mungeli Chhattisgarh. --- **Non-Applicant**

MCRC No. 9186 of 2026

Rampal Singh Rajput S/o Shri Aaju Singh Rajput Aged About 53 Years R/o Village- Lormi, P.S. Lormi, District- Mungeli (C.G.). ---**applicant**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station- Lalpur, Mungeli, District- Mungeli (C.G.). --- **Non-Applicant**

MCRC No. 8882 of 2026

Hemant Rajput S/o Ranjit Singh Rajput Aged About 26 Years R/o Gram Jhafal P/s Lalpur, Distt. Mungeli Chhattisgarh. ---**applicant**

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. Lalpur, Tehsil Lormi, Distt. Mungeli Chhattisgarh. --- **Non-Applicant**

For Applicants	**:**	Mr. Prafull N. Bharat, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Awadh Tripathi, Advocate Mr. Keshav Dewangan, Advocate Mr. Khulesh Sahu, Advocate Mr. Yashpal Singh, Advocate Mr. Chanmeet Singh Chhabra, Advocate
For Non-Applicant/State	**:**	Mr. Dharmesh Shrivastava, Deputy Advocate General,
For Objector	**:**	Mr. Devendra Kumar Bhadwaj, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

27/10/2026

1. Since all these bail applications arise out of the same crime number, they are heard together and are being decided by this common order.

2. The applicants have preferred these bail applications as they have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 40/2026, registered at Police Station Lalpur, District Mungeli, for offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 61(2), 140(2), and 238 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Prosecution case in brief is that the deceased, Damodar Singh Rajput, was allegedly murdered pursuant to a criminal conspiracy hatched by the co-accused persons to usurp his land and other properties. It is alleged that the present applicant, Sanjay Yadav, along with other co-accused persons and juveniles in conflict with law, abducted and murdered the deceased on 21.03.2026 and concealed his body. On 22.03.2026, Balveer Singh lodged a missing person report at Police Station Lalpur. During investigation, Sanjay Yadav was arrested on 30.03.2026 on the basis of CCTV footage showing him chasing the deceased's motorcycle. In his memorandum statement, he allegedly disclosed that Ranjeet Singh Rajput alias Munna and Rampal Rajput had engaged him to commit the murder for consideration. On the basis of his statement, the involvement of 15 accused persons, including four juveniles, came to light. According to the memorandum statement, Ranjeet Singh Rajput alias Munna approached Sanjay Yadav and offered him money and land for eliminating the deceased due to a property dispute. Sanjay Yadav thereafter contacted certain juveniles and other persons and arranged a meeting at Mungeli, where the deceased was identified as the target. It is alleged that Ranjeet offered ₹2 lakh to the hired persons and subsequently provided ₹2 lakh to Sanjay Yadav as an advance. The plan was to execute the murder on 21.03.2026, when the deceased was expected to visit his brother's residence for a Jawara programme. On 21.03.2026, Sanjay Yadav, along with the other accused persons, allegedly followed the deceased in a

rented Hyundai Eon car and on motorcycles. Near Manoharpur, the deceased was made to fall from his motorcycle, strangled with a towel, and taken away in the car. When the vehicle repeatedly broke down, the deceased's body was transferred to a Tata Spacio car with the assistance of Devraj Sahu. The body was subsequently buried in a pit in the Devsara forest. The deceased's mobile phone and other belongings were taken away, and the mobile phones were allegedly disposed of in the Sangam at Prayagraj. It is further alleged that on 22.03.2026, Ranjeet alias Munna and Paleshwar Singh Rajput met Sanjay Yadav and paid him ₹1 lakh for executing the murder. They allegedly instructed him not to disclose the conspiracy and to falsely implicate the deceased's son. Sanjay Yadav subsequently disclosed the alleged sequence of events during interrogation and stated that he had accepted the contract due to a debt of ₹16 lakh. The police thereafter completed the investigation and filed the charge-sheet against the accused persons. The prosecution alleges that Rampal Rajput and Ranjeet Singh Rajput engaged Sanjay Yadav to murder Damodar Singh Rajput for consideration. However, applicant Sanjay Yadav did not name applicant Hemant Rajput in his memorandum statement, nor was any specific role attributed to him.

4. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the applicants would submit that, although the missing person report was lodged by Balveer Singh, co-accused Ranjit Singh had also accompanied him. He would further submit that the dead body of the deceased was examined on 29.03.2026 and the post-mortem examination was conducted on 30.03.2026. As per the post-mortem report, the death was unnatural and homicidal, the cause of death was asphyxia, and antemortem ligature marks were present. He would contend that the memorandum statements of accused Pushparaj Tandon, Shrawan, Jeetu, Ashish,

Sanjay Yadav, and Devraj were recorded on 30.03.2026 at 9:10 a.m., 9:20 a.m., 9:30 a.m., 10:15 a.m., 10:30 a.m., and 10:40 a.m., respectively. He would further submit that the memorandum statements of the other co-accused persons were not recorded. It is contended that applicant Sanjay Yadav did not name the present applicants in his memorandum statement and that there is no material against the other accused persons except the memorandum statement. It is also argued that the call detail records of Sanjay Yadav do not reveal any conversation with the six persons who allegedly participated in the murder of Damodar Singh Rajput. Further, there is no evidence of any financial transaction, including a bank trail, or tower location data implicating the applicants. It is submitted that the applicants have been implicated solely on the basis of the confessional statement of Sanjay Yadav.

5. It is further submitted that the call detail records of Sanjay Rajput, the son of the deceased, the daughter of the deceased, and the Investigating Officer, Sundarlal Gorle, have also been referred to in the case. Learned Senior Counsel would argue that the applicants would not derive any benefit from the death of Damodar Singh Rajput, whereas the deceased's son, Sanjay Rajput, would be the beneficiary. It is further submitted that there was enmity between Damodar Singh Rajput and his son, Sanjay Singh Rajput.

6. Learned Senior Counsel would further submit that the deceased, Damodar Singh Rajput, had instituted a civil suit for declaration of title against his son in respect of the land purchased by him on 02.02.2026, thereby indicating a possible motive for Sanjay Singh Rajput to commit the murder, yet he has not been implicated as an accused. It is also submitted that the co-accused persons, namely, Ajay Singh Rajput, Paragraj, and Paleshwar Singh Rajput, have been enlarged on regular bail vide orders dated 16.09.2026 passed in M.Cr.C. Nos. 6332/2026,

7723/2026, and 6652/2026, respectively. It is further contended that applicant Hemant Rajput has not been implicated in the murder of Damodar Singh Rajput and that no material against him is available in the charge-sheet. On these grounds, learned Senior Counsel prays that the bail applications be allowed.

7. On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposed the bail applications, submitting that the case involves a pre-planned contract killing. Co-accused Ranjeet Singh Rajput alias Munna and Rampal Rajput hired Sanjay Yadav, whose complicity is corroborated by CCTV footage showing him trailing the victim. Sanjay Yadav mobilised other co-accused, including juveniles, executed the murder on 21.03.2026, and Rs. 83,000/- as proceeds of crime was recovered directly from his possession. Two vehicles used in the offence were seized at the instance of the applicants. Subsequent conduct, including discarding the victim's mobile phone in the Sangam at Prayagraj, establishes criminal conspiracy, meeting of minds, and common intention. However, the State counsel fairly conceded that applicant Hemant Rajput was neither named in the memorandum statement nor was any overt act or role attributed to him.

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

9. Perusal of the orders passed in M.Cr.C. Nos. 6332/2026, 7723/2026, and 6652/2026 reveals that the said co-accused persons were not named in the memorandum statement of applicant Sanjay Yadav, and no incriminating articles were seized from their possession. However, the names of the present applicants, except applicant Hemant Rajput, have been specifically mentioned, and specific roles have been attributed to them in the memorandum statement of applicant Sanjay Yadav. The CCTV footage indicates the involvement of applicant Sanjay Yadav, who was allegedly engaged by Ranjit Singh Rajput and Rampal Singh Rajput to commit the murder of Damodar Singh Rajput.

10. Prima facie, the material on record indicates the existence of a criminal conspiracy, including a meeting of minds, financial transactions, the use of two vehicles in the commission of the offence, and a common intention among the accused persons. Their specific conduct also prima facie establishes a case against the applicants, except applicant Hemant Rajput.

11. Having regard to the foregoing facts and circumstances, the bail applications preferred by the applicants, except applicant Hemant Rajput, are hereby **rejected**. Accordingly, the bail application preferred by applicant Hemant Rajput (MCRC/8882/2026) is **allowed**.

12. It is directed that in the event of the applicant - Hemant Rajput 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