CGHC010403542026 2026:CGHC:45001

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Digitally signed by SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Date: 2026.10.26 15:51:19 +0530

MCRC No. 9983 of 2026

- Dablu Prasad Gupta S/o Late Bhola Sao, Aged About 27 Years R/o Khendrakala, P.S. Chattarpur, District Palamu (Jharkhand)

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station In Charge, P.S. Ramanujganj, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Bhupendra Singh, Advocate
For State : Ms. Ankita Sukla, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

26.10.2026

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 applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 176/2024 registered at Police Station Ramanujganj, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 309(6), 310(6), 311, 312 of BNS and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act.

2. Earlier, first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 4654 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 15.05.2026.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 11.09.2024, at about 1:15 p.m., three unknown persons entered Rajesh Jewellers, situated in front of Gandhi

Stadium, Ramanujganj, and assaulted the shop owner/complainant, Rajesh Kumar Soni, on the head with butt of a pistol, causing bleeding injuries. Thereafter, they looted approximately 5 kg of gold jewellery, 7 kg of silver jewellery and Rs. 7 lakh in cash from the shop. They also took away jewellery and mobile phones belonging to the customers present in the shop before fleeing from the spot. The total value of the stolen property was estimated at approximately ₹2.85 crore. On such complaint, Police has registered aforesaid offence against the present applicant.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant would submit that after rejection of first bail application, 2 witnesses have been examined out of 45 witnesses and they have not supported the case of prosecution. He would further submit that applicant is in jail since 24.11.2025, and trial may take some time for its conclusion. He would submit that on the ground of delay in trial, instant application may be allowed.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail application. She would submit that first bail application was rejected on merits. She would further submit that out of 45 witnesses 02 have already been examined, and therefore, ground of delay is not available to the applicant. She would contend 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 facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of allegations levelled against the applicant, fact that applicant is alleged to have assaulted the complainant on head with butt of a pistol and looted gold and silver jewellery worth approximately ₹2.85 crore along with ₹7 lakh in

cash and further fact that first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 4654 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 15.05.2026 and 02 out of 45 prosecution witnesses have been examined, therefore, the trial is in progress and ground of delay in trial is not made out, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant.

8. Accordingly, this bail application fails and is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant