CGHC010388002026 2026:CGHC:46896

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9450 of 2026

1 - Kaushal Chandravanshi S/o Arjun Chandravanshi Aged About 20 Years R/o Village Neurgaon, P. S. Bodla, District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through SHO, Police Station- Pipariya, District- Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh. **... Respondent**

For Applicant	:	Mr. Vaibhav A. Goverdhan, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Ms. Monika Thakur, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

05.11.2026

1. The applicant has preferred this **Second Bail Application** under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 320/2025, registered at Police Station Pipariya, District Kabirdham (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 137(2), 64(2)(m) and 65(1) of BNS and 4(2) & 6 of POCSO Act and Section 3(2)(v) SC and ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

Digitally signed by JYOTI JHA
Date: 2026.11.05 15:19:17 +0530

2. Earlier First Bail application was withdrawn by the learned counsel applicant in MCRC No. 3690 of 2026 vide order dated 30.07.2026.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the applicant sexually assaulted the victim, aged about 14 years and 3 months on the pretext of marriage. The FIR was lodged against the applicant by the father of the victim, pursuant to which the offences, as stated above, were registered against him.

4. In pursuance of the notice dated 07.10.2026 issued to the victim, today the victim along with her mother appeared before this Court through video conferencing from concerned DLSA and have raised their objection to releasing the applicant on bail.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant would submit that victim, her father and her mother have already been examined before the learned trial Court and they have not supported the case of the prosecution. He would further submit that on the date of alleged incident, the age of the victim was more than 18 years. It is also argued that victim has denied the suggestions put forth by the Public Prosecutor. The applicant is in jail since 04.12.2025. He, therefore, prays for grant of bail to the applicant.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the bail application and submit that the victim was 14 years and 3 months of age on the date of the incident and serious allegations have been levelled against the present applicant and, therefore, application moved by the applicant for grant of bail may be rejected.

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

diary.

8. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that, though the victim was aged about 15 years at the time of the incident, the victim, her father and her mother have already been examined before the trial Court and all three of them have not supported the case of the prosecution and have turned hostile and further considering the fact that the victim has denied the suggestions put forth by the learned Public Prosecutor and also considering the fact that the applicant is in custody since 04.12.2025 and that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time and without commenting on the merits of the case, I am inclined to grant bail to the present applicant. Accordingly, the bail application is **allowed**.

9. Let applicant be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:-

> **(i)** The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the trial court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.
>
> **(ii)** The applicant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the trial court may proceed against him under Section 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
>
> **(iii)** In case, the applicant misuses the liberty of bail during

trial and in order to secure his presence, proclamation under Section 84 of BNSS is issued and the applicant fails to appear before the court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against him, in accordance with law, under Section 209 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(iv) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case, (ii) framing of charge and (iii) recording of statement under Section 351 of BNSS. If in the opinion of the trial court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the trial court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

Jyoti