CGHC010372972026 2026:CGHC:45065

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9095 of 2026

M. Laxman Rao @ Lucky Son Of Late M. Sakli @ Devdu, Aged About 19 Years R/o 32 Bunglow Near T. P. T. School Storepara, Puraina, Police Station Bhilai - 3, Durg (C.G.) **... Applicant**

Digitally signed by ALLENA ANJANI KUMAR
Date: 2026.10.28 15:08:32 +0530

versus

Union Of India Through Station House Officer, R. P. F. Post - Bhilai, District Durg (C.G.) **... Non-Applicant**

For Applicant	:	Shri Kunwar Mahendra Singh holds the brief of Shri Vimlesh Bajpai, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant/Union of India.	:	Shri Ramakant Mishra, Deputy Socilitor General of India.

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAKESH MOHAN PANDEY)

Order on Board

26/10/2026

1. This is the **First bail application** filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.11/2026 registered at Police Station Bhilai-3, District Durg (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Section 3(a) of the Railway Property (Unauthorized Possession) Act.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, the applicant was found in possession of Railway Property, i.e., 15 kilograms of copper cable wire,

which was stolen from the coach No.243398 SEC (B-1), from the coach No.171905/C SEC (A-1) and coach No.247066 SEC (GS-D2) of train No.08241/08242 Bilaspur – Matgaon Special Express and subsequently stolen property was sold to dealer. During course of investigation, the Railway Police recovered 15 kilograms of copper cable wire on instance of the present applicant. On such allegations, the Railway police registered the offence as stated above.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would argue that the applicant is innocent person and has falsely been implicated. He is a tender age of 19 years; charge-sheet has already been filed; applicant is in jail since 20.05.2026; the applicant has 4 criminal antecedents and in all cases, the applicant has admitted his guilt and conclusion of the trial is likely to take some considerable time. Therefore, he would pray that the bail application may be allowed and the applicant may be enlarged on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Union of India would oppose the bail application. He would contend that the applicant has criminal antecedents of similar nature, registered in the year 2025 and two cases registered in the year 2026 and that, the stolen property was recovered at the instance of the applicant, therefore, the bail application deserves to be rejected.

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

6. Having considered the fact that the applicant committed theft of Railway property and was in unlawful possession of the same and likewise, he committed the theft of Railway property in the year 2025

and also in the year 2026 and that, he has total 4 criminal antecedents of similar nature and recovery of the stolen property was made at the instance of the applicant, I am not inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail.

7. Accordingly, the first bail application filed by the applicant fails and is hereby **rejected.**

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Anjani