CGHC010404772026 2026:CGHC:45221

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 10050 of 2026

1 - Vinod Tripathi S/o Shri Guru Prasad Tripathi Aged About 39 Years R/o Village Baturakachhar, Tehsil And P.S. Pipariya, District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through S H O P.S. Pipariya, District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh. **... Non-applicant**

For Applicant	:	Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate
For Non-applicant	:	Ms. Ankita Shukla, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order On Board

27.10.2026

1) This is the Second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant arrested in connection with Crime No. 321/2025, registered at Police Station Pipariya, Dist.- Kabirdham (CG) for the offence punishable under Sections 108, 85, 3(5) of BNS. Earlier first bail application of the applicant bearing MCRC No.6725 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 27.07.2026.

2) The prosecution case, in brief, is that the deceased, Rani Tripathi, stated in her dying declarations recorded by the police and the Executive Magistrate that her husband, the applicant, was a habitual drunkard who frequently abused and assaulted her, while her in-laws also harassed her and asked her to leave the matrimonial home. Unable to bear the alleged cruelty, she poured turpentine oil on herself and set herself on fire on 07.10.2025, resulting in her death. Accordingly, the offence was registered against the applicant and the co-accused for abetment of suicide and related offences. Hence, the bail application.

3) Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that, as per the dying declaration, the applicant had left the house after a quarrel, and thereafter, the deceased was allegedly abused by her father-in-law and brother-in-law. He also submits that the applicant has been in jail since 20.01.2026, his minor children are dependent on him, and the trial is likely to take some time to conclude. He contends that the co-accused have been granted bail. It is further submitted that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits in MCRC No. 6725 of 2026 vide order dated 27.07.2026. Therefore, he prays for grant of bail to the applicant.

4) On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the charge-sheet has been filed in the present case before the competent Court. She further submits that the deceased married the present applicant in April 2018. She also submits that, in her dying declaration, the deceased categorically stated that, after marriage, she was continuously subjected to cruelty, harassment, and torture at the hands of her husband, i.e., the applicant. She would

contend that the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits and there is no substantial change in circumstances warranting reconsideration of the prayer for bail. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled to be enlarged on bail.

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

6) Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly that the deceased married the applicant in April 2018; in her dying declaration, she alleged that she was continuously subjected to cruelty, physical assault, and harassment by the applicant on account of his habit of consuming liquor; and she attributed persistent acts of cruelty and ill-treatment to him, which allegedly compelled her to set herself ablaze, this Court finds that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. Though the applicant had allegedly left the house after a quarrel with the deceased but the dying declaration specifically attributes persistent cruelty to him. Further, the first bail application of the applicant was rejected on merits by a detailed order passed in MCRC No. 6725 of 2026, and he has not demonstrated any substantial change in circumstances or any new ground warranting reconsideration of the earlier decision. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected.**

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Rekha