CGHC010376852026 2026:CGHC:45059

NAFR

Digitally signed by RAMESH KUMAR VATTI
Date: 2026.10.27 11:18:27 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9127 of 2026

*** -** Rahul Vishwakarma S/o Vijay Vishwakarma Aged About 27 Years R/o Block No. 18, Room No. 03 B.S.U.P. Colony Kachna, P.S. Khamhardih, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

Versus

*** -** State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Mandir Hasaud, Raipur District Raipur (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. C.R. Sahu, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	:	Ms. Sameeksha Gupta, Panel Lawyer

Hon’ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Order on Board

26/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this first bail application under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 as he is in jail since 18.08.2026 in connection with Crime No. 52/2020 registered in Police Station- Mandir Hasaud, District Raipur (CG) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 457 & 380 of BNS.

2. As per case of prosecution, an F.I.R. for commission of offence punishable under Sections 457 and 380 of IPC was registered against the present applicant in the year 2020. The applicant remained absconding and subsequently moved an application for grant of bail before the learned Court below on the basis of directions issued by the Hon’ble Supreme Court during Covid-19 period. The bail application of

the present applicant has been rejected vide order dated 22.08.2026 on the ground that the applicant has one more criminal antecedent, and the directions which were issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the year 2020-21 cannot be extended in the year 2026.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant would submit that the applicant had gone for his livelihood and therefore, he could not approach the learned trial Court for grant of bail in connection Crime No. 52/2020. Thus, he would pray for grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned Panel Lawyer appearing for the State/non-applicant would oppose. She would submit that the applicant remained absconding for considerable period and therefore, this bail application deserves to be rejected.

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

6. Having considered the fact that F.I.R. was registered in the year 2020, applicant remained absconding for considerable period and moved application for grant of bail in the year 2026 and he has one more criminal antecedent, therefore, I am not inclined to release the applicant on regular bail. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

vatti