NIRMALA
RAO

CGHC010376942026 2026:CGHC:44115

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9066 of 2026

1 - Vinay Kumar Dhruvanshi S/o Bhagirathi Dhruvanshi Aged About 24 Years R/o Village Kasahi, P.S. Kurud, Distt. Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, P.S. Bhakhara, Distt. Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Ms. Sweksha Sharma, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Saini, Dy.G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Order on Board

12/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this first bail application under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 as he is in jail since 08.07.2026 in connection with Crime No. 77/2026 registered in Police Station – Bhakhara, District Dhamtari (CG) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 309(6), 311, 126(2) & 351(3) of BNS and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act.

2. As per the prosecution case, on 06.07.2026, at around 10:00 p.m., the complainant, Manish Kumar Sonwani, lodged a written report at Police Station Bhakhara, District Dhamtari, alleging that while he was transporting cattle in a transport carrier along with his father, the present applicant and three other accused persons intercepted the vehicle and demanded Rs. 50,000/- from the complainant's father. Subsequently, an amount of Rs. 28,500/- was transferred to the bank account of the owner of the vehicle through Paytm. Accordingly, the F.I.R. was registered on 07.07.2026, and the aforesaid offences were registered against the accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would contend that the applicant's vehicle, a Toofan Cruiser bearing registration No. CG-05-X-4668, and the complainant's transport carrier met with an accident and that, owing to the complainant's negligence, the applicant demanded the repair charges for his vehicle. He would further submit that the complainant's father himself transferred a sum of Rs. 28,500/- through Paytm to the bank account of the vehicle's owner, namely, Neeraj Dhruwanshi. He would contend that no cash amount, as alleged, was demanded from or taken from the complainant's party. He would further submit that the charge-sheet has already been filed, the applicant has been in jail since 07.07.2026, and he has no criminal antecedents of a similar nature. He would, therefore, pray for grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned Government Advocate appearing for the State/non-applicant would submit that there are serious allegations of extortion and loot against the present applicant and the co-accused

persons and, therefore, the instant bail application deserves to be dismissed.

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

6. Perusal of the case diary would reveal that a knife was seized from the co-accused, namely, Neeraj Dhruwanshi. The charge-sheet has already been filed, and the applicant has been in jail since 07.07.2026. A sum of Rs. 28,500/- was transferred through Paytm by the complainant's party to the bank account of the vehicle's owner, namely, Neeraj Dhruwanshi. Furthermore, no incriminating article was seized at the instance of the applicant. Having regard to these facts and circumstances, I am inclined to release the applicant on regular bail. 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.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Nimmi