CGHC010384212026 2026:CGHC:45102

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9212 of 2026

1 - Sohail Rana S/o Umed Rana Aged About 19 Years R/o Village Gurjarpur, P.S. Kandla, District Shyamli (U.P.) (Permanent Address), Presently R/o Hirapur, Near Gurudwara, Hirapur, P.S. Kabir Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

... Applicant(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer (S H O) P.S. Aamanaka, District Raipur Chhattisgarh --- **Non-applicant**

For Applicant	**:**	Ms. Anamika Jain, Advocate
For Non-applicant	**:**	Mr. Sourabh Sahu, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

26/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this Second Bail Application under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in connection with Crime No. 310/2025, registered at Police Station Aamanaka, District Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1) and 3(5) of BNS and 25(1-B)(b) and 27 of Arms Act.
2. First Bail Application was dismissed for want of prosecution vide order dated 17.09.2026 in MCRC No. 6606 of 2026.
3. That, the case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 16.09.2025, the complainant, namely Prakash Sahu, lodged a report alleging, inter alia, that at about 4:30 a.m., Vikash Verma, a friend of his son, came to his house

and informed him that on 14.09.2025, at about 11:00 p.m., his son, Ajay Sahu, was found lying in an injured condition near Rama TMT, Tenduwa, and had been taken to NKD Hospital, Birgaon, for treatment. Upon reaching the hospital, the complainant found his son unconscious, unable to speak, and having sustained a grievous head injury. On making inquiries from his son's friends, the complainant came to know that some unknown person had allegedly assaulted his son on the head with a weapon with the intention of killing him. The injured was admitted to the hospital but was later discharged against medical advice and died during subsequent treatment on 19.10.2025. Consequently, a case was registered against the present applicant and the co-accused persons. Hence, the present bail application.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that PW-1 Dr. Devprakash Dewangan and alleged eyewitnesses PW-2 Amit Sinha and PW-3 Ajay Verma have already been examined and they have narrated a different version of the prosecution story. She also submits that the applicant has been in jail since 18.09.2025 and the trial is likely to take considerable time for its conclusion, as twenty witnesses have been cited by the prosecution. He, therefore, prays that the applicant may be enlarged on regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel opposes the bail application and submits that there are four eyewitnesses to the incident and that an iron rod, alleged to be the weapon of offence, has been seized at the instance of the present applicant. He further submits that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature, as the victim sustained grievous head

injuries and subsequently succumbed to the same. He, therefore, prays for rejection of the bail application.

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

7. It is a well-settled principle of law that, while considering a bail application, the High Court cannot conduct a mini-trial or undertake a detailed examination of the evidence. The reliability and credibility of the witnesses are matters to be assessed by the learned Trial Court during the course of trial.

8. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the nature and gravity of the offence, the statements of the eyewitnesses regarding the alleged assault on the deceased namely Ajay Sahu by the present applicant and the co-accused persons, the grievous head injury sustained by the deceased, who subsequently succumbed to the said injury during treatment, and the seizure of the alleged weapon of offence, i.e., an iron rod, at the instance of the present applicant, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected**.

Sd/-
Rakesh Mohan Pandey
JUDGE

Jyoti