CGHC010399902026 2026:CGHC:45754

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9601 of 2026

Pradeep Verma @ Paddu Nanu Son Of Ramesh Kumar Verma Aged About 40 Years Resident Of Lakhandi Ramghat, Police Station Sakri, District - Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Civil Line, District Bilaspur, (C.G)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Rahul Goswami, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Jitendra Shrivastava, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

29.10.2026

1. This is the First bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.

860/2026 registered at Police Station : Civil Line, District : Bilaspur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 115 (2), 119 (1), 296 and 351 (3) of BNS.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that a report was lodged by the informant, Ajay Khute, stating that the accused, Pradeep Verma alias Paddu, frequently consumed tea and biscuits at his tea shop situated at Mangla Chowk and left without paying. The accused also repeatedly demanded money from the informant to purchase intoxicants. Out of fear, the informant used to give him money, and whenever he refused, the accused threatened to kill him. On 21.06.2026, when the accused demanded money from the informant, he took out an object resembling a knife and threatened to kill him. On 22.06.2026, at around 2:00 p.m., the accused came to the informant's tea shop and assaulted him with an iron-like object in his hand, striking him on the left eyebrow and nose. On the basis of the said report, a case was registered under the relevant provisions of law, and the investigation was taken up.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the allegations levelled against the applicant are false and that the applicant has not committed the alleged offence. Learned counsel further submits that the applicant has been in custody since 30.07.2026 and that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. It is also submitted that the allegations made against the applicant are matters of trial and that his continued detention is not warranted. Accordingly, learned counsel for the applicant prays that the applicant be enlarged on bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and

submits that the applicant/accused has committed a serious offence. It is submitted that the applicant had repeatedly demanded money from the informant for purchasing intoxicants and threatened him with dire consequences upon refusal. It is further submitted that, on 21.06.2026, the applicant threatened the informant with an object resembling a knife and, on 22.06.2026, assaulted him with an iron-like object, causing injuries to his left eyebrow and nose. Learned State counsel further submits that the applicant has three live criminal antecedents pertaining to the years 2025 and 2026, involving offences of a similar nature. Accordingly, considering the nature and gravity of the allegations and the applicant's criminal antecedents, learned State counsel prays for rejection of the bail application.

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

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the applicant and learned State counsel, and upon perusal of the case diary and the materials available on record, this Court finds that the allegations levelled against the applicant are serious in nature. The applicant is alleged to have repeatedly demanded money from the informant for purchasing intoxicants and threatened him with dire consequences upon refusal. It is further alleged that, on 21.06.2026, the applicant threatened the informant with an object resembling a knife and, on the following day, assaulted him with an iron-like object, causing injuries to his left eyebrow and nose. This Court further takes note of the fact that the applicant has three live criminal antecedents pertaining to the years 2025 and 2026, involving offences of a similar nature. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the

manner in which the alleged incident occurred, the injuries reportedly sustained by the informant, and the applicant's criminal antecedents, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail at this stage. Accordingly, having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds no sufficient ground to grant the privilege of bail to the applicant. The bail application is, therefore, rejected.

7. Consequently, the bail application is hereby rejected.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Saurabh