CGHC010371482026 2026:CGHC:42899

SOURABH PATEL Digitally signed by SOURABH PATEL Date: 2026.10.05 16:17:26 +0530

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9312 of 2026

1 - Digeshwar Lodhi @ Diggu S/o Manoj Lodhi, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Thakur Diyapara, Khamtarai Road, P/ S Arang, Distt- Raipur (C.G.).

2 - Madhusudan Lodhi @ Madhu S/o Late Mukesh Lodhi, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Bhothli Bhatapara, P/ S Arang, Distt- Raipur (C.G.).

... Applicants

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through P/ S Arang, Distt- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	**:**	Mr. Lukesh Kumar Mishra, Advocate, through V.C
For Respondent/State	**:**	Mr. Rohitashva Singh, Dy.G.A. with Mr. Suresh Tandon, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal

Order On Board

05.10.2026

1. This is the 02nd bail applications filed u/s 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicants who have been arrested in connection with Crime No.473/2025 registered at Police Station Arang, District Raipur (CG) for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 238 & 191(2) of BNS against applicant Madhusudan Lodhi and 103(1), 238(A), 190 & 191(2) of BNS against applicant Digeshwar Lodhi.

2. The first bail applications filed by the applicants were dismissed on merits by this Court vide orders dated 13.04.2026 passed in MCRC Nos. 3192/2026 and 3030/2026.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 12.08.2025, the complainant reported that the dead body of deceased Girija Shankar Dhiwar was found under suspicious circumstances on a mound near the canal on the road leading to Ratakat. During the investigation, it was revealed that the deceased, a mason by profession, had a personal dispute and ongoing animosity with another mason from his village, applicant Madhusudan Lodhi. Upon interrogation, applicant Madhusudan disclosed that the deceased frequently used obscene language during payment disputes and had insulted him in front of his wife at his home. Seeking revenge, on 11.08.2025, applicant Madhusudan took the deceased to a liquor shop near Arang under the pretext of settling accounts for work done at Shiv Prasad Chandrakar's house. According to the plan, applicant Madhusudan and his associates—Digeshwar Lodhi, Neelkanth Lodhi, Ajay Nishad, Jaiprakash Lodhi, and Kamal Lodhi—consumed alcohol with the deceased. At the canal-side mound, a confrontation occurred. It is alleged that the accused collectively assaulted the deceased, and applicant Madhusudan, with the assistance of applicant Digeshwar, strangled the deceased using a yellow cloth (Gamcha). They subsequently burnt the cloth at Hathmar pond. Following the investigation, chargesheet has

been filed against the accused persons under the relevant sections.

4. Learned counsel for applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the case. He submits that out of total six accused persons, four have already been granted bail. He further submits that out of total 20 witnesses, only 07 have been examined, the applicants are in jail since 13.08.2025 and there is no likelihood of the trial to be concluded at the earliest. Therefore, considering all these facts, the applicants may be released on bail.

5. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, opposing the bail applications submits that the four co-accused who have been granted bail are not similarly situated to the present applicants. He contends that these two applicants are the main accused who strangulated the deceased, there was clear motive for commission of the offence and that blood-stained clothes have been seized from them. Hence, considering the nature of offence and the fact that there is no change in circumstances, the applicants do not deserve to be released on bail.

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

7. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the nature and gravity of offence and the material collected and available on record against the applicants and and also considering that out of total 20

witnesses only 07 has been examined till date, this Court is of the considered view that no such change in circumstances warranting grant of bail to the applicants is made out, this Court is not inclined to release the applicants on bail.

8. Accordingly, the bail application stand **rejected**.

9. However, looking to the custody period of the applicants, the trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as early as possible preferably within a period of 05 months.

10. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
JUDGE

$ourabh