CGHC010381942026 2026:CGHC:44230

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9115 of 2026

1 - Bhupendra Kumar Dhritlahre S/o Santanram Dhritlahare Aged About 26 Years R/o Village Gorakhpur, Police Station Setganga Tehsil Mungeli District Mungeli Chhattisgarh. --- **Applicant(s)**

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station City Kotwali Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh.

--- **Respondent(s)**

MCRC No. 9131 of 2026

1 - Suraj Kumar Bhaskar S/o Santosh Bhaskar Aged About 21 Years R/o Village - Khaira Setganga, Police Station - Setganga, Tahsil - Mungeli, District - Mungeli (C.G.)

---Applicant(s)

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station - City Kotwali Mungeli, District - Mungeli (C.G.) **... Non-applicant**

For Applicants	**:**	Mr. Chandrikaditya Pandey Advocate
For Non-applicant	**:**	Ms. Ankita Shukla, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

13/10/2026

1. The applicants have preferred this First Bail Application under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail, as they have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 275/2026, registered at Police

Digitally signed by JYOTI JHA
Date: 2026.10.13 18:04:13 +0530

Station City Kotwali, Mungeli District Mungeli Chhattisgarh for the offence punishable under 34(2) and 59(A) of the Chhattisgarh Excise Act.

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the officers of Police Station concerned, received a secret information from the informant and on the basis of the said information conducted a raid and seized 52.920 bulk liters of country made liquor from the joint possession of the applicants, thereafter, Police has registered an aforesaid offence against the present applicants.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the applicants would submit that the applicants have falsely been implicated in the present case and they are innocent. He would further submit that the applicant has no criminal antecedents. Learned counsel would further submit that the applicants are in jail since 04.09.2026 and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude; thus, he would pray that the applicant may be enlarged on regular bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel would oppose the bail application and submit that 52.920 bulk liters of country made liquor was seized from the joint possession of the present applicants, therefore, they are not entitled to grant of regular bail.

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

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the allegations levelled against the applicants, and considering the fact that quantity of liquor seized from joint the

possession of the applicants; the applicants have no previous criminal antecedents and further considering that the applicants are in jail since 04.09.2026, and the trial is likely to take some time to conclude, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the applicant.

7. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicants is **allowed**. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond for a sum of **Rs.50,000/-** with one surety each in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail, on following conditions :-

> (i) They 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 them from disclosing such fact to the Court;
> (ii) They shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, &
> (iii) They shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

The observation made hereinabove is for the purpose of deciding this bail application only, the trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits.

Sd/-
Rakesh Mohan Pandey
JUDGE

Jyoti