CGHC010378222026 2026:CGHC:44220

NAFR

NIRMALA RAO

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9104 of 2026

1 - Kabirdas @ Vikki Das S/o Shyamdas Aged About 21 Years R/o Village Motipur (Majhapara) Police Station Darima District Surguja Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Police Station Darima District Surguja Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Ms. Jigyasa Singh, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	:	Ms. Smriti Shrivastava, P.L.

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAKESH MOHAN PANDEY

Order on Board

13/10/2026

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.205/2026 registered at Police Station Darima, District Surguja (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 331(4), 305(A), 61, 111 & 238 of BNS.

2. As per the prosecution case, the complainant, Suresh Mahajan, who owns a cloth shop, lodged an F.I.R. on 06.09.2026 alleging that, during the intervening period between 04.09.2026 and 05.09.2026, some unidentified persons had committed theft of Rs. 2,00,000/-, a DVR and a Wi-Fi router. On the basis of the said complaint, the police registered the aforesaid offences against the present applicant. During the course of the investigation, the applicant and the co-accused, Siddharth Nishad, were taken into custody. At the instance of the present applicant, an amount of Rs. 5,000/- was recovered, whereas an amount of Rs. 2,03,580/- was recovered from the co-accused.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant has been in jail since 07.09.2026, has no criminal antecedents, and that the charge-sheet has already been filed. He would further submit that the trial is likely to take some time to conclude. He would, therefore, pray for grant of regular bail to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail application and submit that the applicant and the co-accused committed the theft and that the stolen property was seized from their possession. He would, therefore, contend that 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 an amount of Rs. 2,03,580/- was recovered from the co-accused, whereas only Rs. 5,000/- was recovered at the instance of the present applicant, that the charge-sheet has already been filed, that the applicant has no criminal

antecedents, and that he has been in jail since 07.09.2026, I am inclined to allow the bail application. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed.

7. Let the applicant be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the Court concerned with 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 from disclosing such fact to the Court;

(ii) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to 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 disposal of the trial.

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

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)

JUDGE

Nimmi