CGHC010380732026 2026:CGHC:44516

PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Digitally signed by PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Date: 2026.10.15 11:00:27 +0530

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1636 of 2026

- Rajesh Singh S/o Rajnarayan Singh, Aged About 51 Years Resident Of House No. 134, Street No. 6, Deepak Nagar, Durg, Police Station - Mohan Nagar, Civil, Tehsil And Revenue District Durg C.G.

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer - Mohan Nagar, Durg, Distt - Durg C.G.

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Rajeev Shrivastava, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Jaydeep Singh Yadav, Advocate and Ms. Sakshi Chhabra, Advocate
For Respondent-State	:	Dr. Surendra Dewangan, Panel Lawyer
For Objector	:	Mr. Ashish Pandey, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

ORDER ON BOARD

14/10/2026

1. Applicant has preferred this application under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail as he apprehends his arrest in connection with Crime No. 525/2026 registered at Police Station- Mohan Nagar District Durg (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 109, 296, 351(3), 3(5), 61(2) and 111 of BNS, 2023.

2. Case of prosecution, in brief, is that one Vinay Kumar Singh lodged a report to the concerned police station on 25.07.2026 stating that on 24.07.2026, he received a phone call from Vicky Singh who informed that Rajesh Singh has called him regarding settling of some accounts of devbhumi land. At 12:00 pm, when he along with Narendra Singh,

Rupesh Yadav went to the place, he saw that Vicky Singh, Rajesh Singh, Ashok Singh and Vijay Memon were present there. Upon seeing the complainant, the accused persons started abusing them, assaulting them by hands and fist and thereafter co-accused Vijay Memon took knife and gave blow to Narendra Singh and complainant Vinay. In the incident Narendra Singh suffered incised wound. The incident was reported to the concerned police station, based upon which aforementioned crime was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that applicant has been falsely implicated in the crime only because there is property dispute and applicant being one of the partner as alleged by the complainant in the F.I.R.. He also contended that no overact has been specifically alleged against applicant and further that wife and son of applicant has submitted CCTV footage along with certificate under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act to show that at the time of alleged incident, applicant was not present on spot. He also contended that one similarly situated co-accused Ashok Singh has been enlarged on bail in MCRCA No. 1489 of 2026 vide order dated 11.09.2026 and the case of applicant is also on similar footings, hence, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the submission of counsel for applicant and would submit that there is specific allegation against applicant of participating in the said crime. He contended that according to the statement of victim/ injured, it is the applicant who was present along with other co-accused persons and upon seeing the injured along with another person accompanied with him, he started abusing and thereafter caught hold of Narendra Singh along with Vicky Singh and has also instructed to other person to assault them upon which he was assaulted with knife by Vijay Memon, in which he suffered four incised wounds over his person.

5. Learned counsel for the objector also opposes the submission of learned counsel for applicant and would submit that he adopts the submission made by learned State counsel.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the documents available in the application.

7. On due consideration of the entirety of the facts and circumstances of the case, submission of learned counsel for the parties, manner in which the offence is alleged to have been committed and the allegation levelled by the victim in his statement against applicant, I do not find present to be a fit case to allow this application for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, this anticipatory bail application is **rejected**.

Sd/-

(**Parth Prateem Sahu**)
JUDGE

pwn