CGHC010405162026 2026:CGHC:46810

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1735 of 2026

Ansh Chandrakar S/o Shri Manoj Kumar Chandrakar Aged About 22 Years R/o Village Kosmi, Ward No. 02, H. No. 35, P.S. Chhura, Tahsil Chhura, District Gariyaband (C.G.)

...Applicant (s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Tikrapara, Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. J.N. Nande, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Varunendra Mishra, Panel Lawyer

S.B.: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

Order On Board

04/11/2026

1. Applicant has filed this application under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short "*BNSS*") for grant of anticipatory bail as he is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.837 of 2026 registered at Police Station- Tikrapara, Raipur, District- Raipur (CG) for offence punishable under Sections 69, 351 (2) of the BNS.

2. Case of prosecution, in brief, is that a written report is lodged by

Digitally signed by PRAVEEN KUMAR SINHA
Date: 2026.11.05 10:59:21 +0530

the victim/complainant against the applicant stating that she met with the applicant in the year 2024. It is alleged that on 4th September 2024 applicant took her near Shubham K. Mart Shop Hanumar Nagar, Raipur and on the false pretext of marriage committed sexual intercourse with her. Thereafter, applicant further establishied physical relationship with her. In the month of October 2024, victim underwent a pregnancy test which was allegedly found positive. It is further alleged that the applicant thereafter subjected her to emotional pressure and allegedly caused her to consume medicines for termination of the pregnancy. Thereafter the applicant/accused has avoided the victim. On 30.10.2024, victim submitted a written complaint against the applicant at Police Station Tikrapara, Raipur, requesting the police officials to call the applicant and advise him to marry her. Pursuant thereto, a counselling proceeding was conducted at the police station in the presence of the applicant's family members, wherein an assurance was given to the victim. However, thereafter, the applicant and his father stopped responding to her telephone calls and also extended threats to kill her.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent. He has not committed any offence. He contended that the victim is a major girl aged about 23 years and the physical relationship, if any, established between them, is consensual in nature. False allegation has been leveled that, on the pretext of marriage, applicant committed sexual

intercourse with her forcefully. According to allegation, applicant since 2024 is continuously establishing physical relation with her due to which she also became pregnant. Therefore, the applicant may be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the submission of counsel for applicant and would submit that applicant established physical relationship with victim continuously on the false pretext of marriage due to which once she became pregnant also.

5. Pursuant to notice issued, victim appeared before this Court through virtual mode and raised objection in grant of bail to the applicant.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record.

7. On due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation, submission of learned counsel for the parties, without commenting anything on merits of the case, I am inclined to allow this anticipatory bail application.

8. Accordingly, application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of arrest of applicant in connection with the aforesaid crime, he shall be released on anticipatory bail by the Officer arresting him on his executing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned arresting officer. Applicant shall also abide by the

following conditions :-

> “(i) that the applicant shall remain available for interrogation before the Investigating Officer as and when required;
>
> (ii) the applicant 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 facts to the Court or to any police officer.”

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Praveen