CGHC010390532026 2026:CGHC:45575

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9482 of 2026

- Manmati Bhuiya W/o Manoj Bhuiya Aged About 30 Years R/o Ward No. 15, Ramanujganj P. S. Ramanujganj District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through- S H O. Ramanujganj District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.

...Non-applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Dheerendra Pandey, Advocate
For Non-applicant	:	Ms. Monika Thakur, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order On Board

28.10.2026

1) The applicant has preferred this First Bail Application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No.140/2026, registered by Police Station Ramanujganj, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 296, 351(3), 115(2), 121(1), 132, 109 and 3(5) of Bhartiya Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2) The prosecution story, in brief, is that on 11.08.2026, the complainant Upendra Kumar Yadav, Forest Guard, lodged a report to the effect that at around 05:45 AM that day, when Pintu Malakar, Forest Guard, was en route to Aragahi Beat for duty, he encountered the applicant and one Manoj Bhuiya carrying teak logs. Upon being questioned, the accused persons hurled filthy abuses and issued death threats to Pintu. They also threw a teak log at Pintu, causing injuries to his head, neck, and left ear. On the basis of the complaint, the police registered the offence and arrested the accused persons, including the applicant.

3) Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is a lady and has been falsely implicated in the present case, as she did not participate in the commission of the afore-stated offence and the main allegation of assaulting the government servant is against co-accused Manoj Bhuiya. He further submits that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedents, the charge-sheet has been filed, and she has been in custody since 11.08.2026. Since the conclusion of the trial may take some time, he prays for the grant of regular bail to the present applicant.

4) On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application, submitting that the applicant and co-accused Manoj Bhuiya, acting in furtherance of their common intention, assaulted the Forest Guard while he was discharging his public duties. She further submits that the medical reports indicate the injuries

sustained by the injured were grievous in nature, and as such, the applicant is not entitled to the grant of bail.

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

6) The case diary contains an injury report indicating that Pintu Malakar sustained a lacerated wound over the left temporo-occipital region. A subsequent CT scan revealed the following findings:-

- A thin rim of extra-axial hematoma (maximum thickness 2.3 mm) along the left temporal region with focal air;
- A few small hemorrhagic contusions with edema in the right temporal lobe; and
- Focal hemorrhage along the right transtentorial and posterior falx

In addition, the District Medical Officer, upon requisition, opined that considering the clinical and radiological findings, the risk of death could not be ruled out had the patient not received prompt medical attention.

7) It is a settled principle of law that the Court's role at the bail stage is confined to verifying the existence of a *prima facie* case. In the present case, an FIR was lodged by a forest official against the applicant making specific allegations to the effect that she and co-accused Manoj Bhuiya, acting in furtherance of their common intention, assaulted the Forest Guard while he was discharging

his public duties, causing multiple injuries; however, the veracity of the allegations made in the FIR cannot be examined in light of the defence taken by Mr. Pandey.

8) Considering the fact and circumstances of the case, nature of injuries sustained by the injured and gravity of offence levelled against the applicant, this Court is not inclined to extend the benefit of bail to the applicant at this stage.

9) Accordingly, the instant bail application is **rejected.**

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Ajinkya