CGHC010372162026 2026:CGHC:43654

NAFR

Digitally signed by RAMESH KUMAR VATTI
Date: 2026.10.08 18:00:59 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8942 of 2026

*** -** Aman Yadav S/o Jitendra Yadav Aged About 26 Years R/o Ward No. 09 Sargaon, P.S. Sargaon, District Mungeli (C.G.)

... Applicant

Versus

*** -** State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Sirgitti, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Aman Pandey, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	:	Ms. Ritika Verma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Order on Board

08/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this first bail application under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 as he is in jail since 26.07.2026 in connection with Crime No. 317/2026 registered in Police Station – Sirgitti, District Bilaspur (CG) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 69 & 296 of BNS.

2. As per case of prosecution, an F.I.R. was lodged by the victim on 02.05.2026 against the applicant making allegation that he sexually assaulted her on pretext of marriage from 21.08.2025 to 13.04.2026. It is also stated that the applicant assured her to marry and therefore, she visited Mumbai, where they stayed for a couple of months and

when applicant refused to marry, she returned and lodged the F.I.R. On such complaint, the police registered the offence as stated above.

3. Mr. Aman Pandey, learned Advocate appearing for the applicant would submit that on the first date of incident, age of the victim was 20 years. He would contend that the victim is an educated and major lady and she her own will maintained relationships with the applicant which was consensual in nature. He would submit that charge-sheet has already been filed, the applicant is in jail since 26.07.2026 and he has no criminal antecedent. Thus, he would pray for grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, Ms. Ritika Verma, learned Panel Lawyer appearing for the State/non-applicant would oppose. She would contend that the present applicant on the pretext of marriage, sexually exploited the victim and subsequently refused to marry. She would submit that the bail application deserves to be dismissed.

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

6. Having considered the facts that on the first date of incident, age of the victim was 20 years, she is an educated lady, she visited Mumbai and stayed along with the applicant for a couple of months, charge-sheet has already been filed, applicant is in jail since 26.07.2026 and he has no criminal antecedent, without commenting anything on merits of the case, I am inclined to grant 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 the 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/her from disclosing such fact to the Court;

II. He shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to a fair and expeditious trial;

III. He shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till the disposal of the trial; and,

IV. He shall not involve himself in any offence of a similar nature in future.

8. The observation made in the course of this order is only for considering the case of the applicant on the application for the grant of regular bail. The concerned trial Court shall not be influenced or bound by any observation made in the course of this order.

9. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

vatti