CGHC010396962026 2026:CGHC:47341

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 2576 of 2026

Ravindra Das S/o Manik Das, Aged About 28 Years R/o Majhapara Korima, P. S. Ambikapur, District Surguja, C.G. (Accused) **... Appellant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station A J K Ambikapur, District Surguja, C.G. (Prosecution) **... Respondent**

Digitally signed by ALLENA ANJANI KUMAR
Date: 2026.11.18 11:21:51 +0530

For Appellant	**:** Shri Akash Shrivastava, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	**:** Shri Keshav Gupta, Government Advocate

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAKESH MOHAN PANDEY)

Order on Board

17/11/2026

1. The complainant/victim appeared virtual mode and has raised no objection in releasing the appellant on bail.

2. The instant criminal appeal filed by the appellant under Section 14A(2) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, the Act, 1989) is for grant of regular bail to him, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.08/2026 registered at Police Station AJK, Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Section 376(2)(n) IPC (Section 69 of BNS) and Section 3(2)(v) of the Act, 1989.

3. As per the case of the prosecution, the prosecutrix/victim lodged a

report at AJK Ambikapur against the appellant making allegations that the appellant and the prosecutrix are known to each other as they residents of same village. The appellant, on false pretext of marriage, enticed her and established forcible physical relations with her and continued the same on several occasions till May, 2026. It is alleged that when the prosecutrix asked the appellant to marry her, then he refused. On such report/complaint, the police registered the offences, as stated above.

4. By order dated 23.09.2026 passed by the learned Special Judge in Special Sessions (Atrocities) case No.66/2026, the bail application filed by the appellant has been rejected against which the appellant has filed this appeal.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant would submit that the prosecutrix has already been examined and she has not supported the case of prosecution. He would contend that the age of the victim on the date of incident was 28 years. It is also argued that on account of some dispute, false F.I.R. was lodged against him and this fact was evident from the evidence of the victim recorded on 03.11.2026. he would refer the evidence of P.W.2, who has also not supported the case of prosecution. He would submit that the appellant is in jail since 04.08.2026 and the trial is likely to take some considerable time, therefore, learned counsel for the appellant would pray that the instant appeal may be allowed and enlarge the appellant on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the submissions of the learned counsel for the appellant. He would submit that the complainant is a member of aboriginal tribe and the appellant herein, knowing very well her social status, committed the offence. It is

also argued that in statement recorded under Section 183 of B.N.S.S., she has made serious allegations of sexual assault against the appellant, and therefore, this appeal deserves to be dismissed.

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

8. Having considered the fact that the appellant has no criminal antecedents; he is in jail since 04.08.2026; victim/prosecutrix has already been examined and she has not supported the case of prosecution; she has denied the suggestions put forth by Public Prosecutor; further she deposed that on account of some dispute between them, a false F.I.R. was lodged; trial may take some time for its conclusion, without commenting any merits of the matter, I am inclined to grant bail to the appellant. Accordingly, the instant appeal is **allowed** and the order dated 23.09.2026 passed by the learned Special Judge in Special Sessions (Atrocities) case No.66/2026 is set aside.

9. It is directed that the appellant shall be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the Court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) he 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 him from disclosing such fact to the Court;

(ii) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, &

(iii) he shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

10. The observation made herein above is for the purpose of deciding this bail application only and the trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Anjani