SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Digitally signed by SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Date: 2026.10.14 10:29:23 +0530

CGHC010399742026 2026:CGHC:43787

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9603 of 2026

- Abhishek Kumar Paikra S/o Manmohit Ram, Aged About 25 Years Caste Kanwar, R/o Village - Rajauli, Tahsil And Police Station - Sonhat, District - Koriya (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Sonhat, District - Koriya (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Vivek Sahu, Advocate
For State : Mr. Aakash Agrawal, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

09.10.2026

1. This is the second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicants who have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 21/2026 registered at Police Station Sonhat, District Koriya (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Section 376(2) (n) of IPC and Sections 4 & 6 of POCSO Act.

2. Earlier, first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 4162 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 09.07.2026.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that victim came into contact with the accused in the year 2020, when she was 16 years old. It is alleged that the

accused induced her on pretext of marriage and established physical relations with her on several occasions over the years. When the victim refused to continue the physical relationship and asked the accused to marry her, he allegedly threatened to defame her and refused to marry her. On such complaint, police registered an FIR against the applicant for aforesaid offence.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant has been falsely implicated. He would further submit that applicant and victim were in a relationship for five years. He would contend that there is a delay in lodging the FIR and no injury was found in the medical examination. He would further contend that applicant is in jail since 16.03.2026, he has no criminal antecedents, and trial is likely to take some time. He would pray for grant of bail to the applicant.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail application and submit that victim was a minor when the applicant established physical relations with her on pretext of marriage. He would further submit that applicant threatened the victim when she refused to continue the relationship and later refused to marry her. He would contend that victim has been examined before the learned Trial Court and she has supported the case of prosecution. He would submit that instant application deserves to be rejected.

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

7. Having considered the nature and gravity of allegations and material available on record, it appears that victim has made serious allegations

against the applicant with regard to sexual assault on pretext of marriage when she was a minor. The statement of the victim has been recorded before the learned Trial Court and she has supported the case of prosecution. Further, first bail application was rejected on merits vide order dated 09.07.2026. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant.

8. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant