CGHC010389332026 2026:CGHC:43264

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1647 of 2026

Sahil Khan S/o Shafeek Khan Aged About 35 Years R/o, Village Bargidad, P.S. Raidih, Distt. Gumla (Jharkhand)

--- **Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Outpost Faguram Of Police Station Dabhara, Distt. Janjgir-Champa (Now Distt. Sakti) (C.G.)

--- **Respondent**

(Cause title is taken from CIS system)

For Applicant : Mr. Ishwar Jaiswal, Advocate

For Respondent/State : Mr. Himanshu Yadu, P.L.

BALRAM PRASAD DEWANGAN
Digitally signed by BALRAM PRASAD DEWANGAN

Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Order On Board

06/10/2026

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 145 of 2026 registered at Police Station Dabhara, District – Sakti (C.G.) under Sections 4, 6 and 10 of Chhattisgarh Agricultural Cattle Preservation Act, 2004.

2. As per the prosecution case, on 01.05.2026, on receipt of secret information that cattle were being transported to a slaughterhouse, the Bolero vehicle bearing registration No. C.G.-15B-3072 was intercepted. Upon interception, driver of the vehicle stopped the vehicle and fled from the spot. During the course of investigation, the police seized a written sale agreement relating to the said vehicle, wherein the applicant has been shown as the owner of the vehicle.

3. Learned counsel for applicant would submit that applicant has been falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged. He submits that according to the case of the prosecution, when vehicle was intercepted, it finds transporting 7 cattle. The number vehicle C.G.-15B-3072 with other description is mentioned in the order impugned. He contended that applicant is neither driver nor owner of vehicle, therefore, applicant is not involved in the commission of crime. Hence, applicant may be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the submission of learned counsel for applicant and would submit that applicant himself is owner and driver of vehicle. Police has collected written sale agreement of vehicle in which applicant is shown to be purchaser of vehicle. He also contended that when vehicle was intercepted, the driver stopped the vehicle on road and ran away towards the field and escaped.

5. I have heard learned counsel for parties and perused the documents placed on record.

6. Considering the fact that there is written agreement to sell of vehicle seized by police in the name of applicant and according to the case of

prosecution, driver of vehicle fled away leaving the vehicle unman when it was intercepted and even in the pleadings before this Court, there is no mention as to who was the driver of the vehicle. In the aforementioned facts of the case, I do not find present to be a fit case to enlarge the applicant on anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is rejected.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Balram