CGHC010408782026 2026:CGHC:45108

RAVI SHANKAR MANDAVI Digitally signed by RAVI SHANKAR MANDAVI

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1758 of 2026

1 - Ritesh Chandravanshi S/o Shri Dilip Chandravanshi, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Dharampura, District Kabirdham (C.G.)

2 - Nilesh Chandravanshi S/o Shri Guniram Chandravanshi, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Darripara, Ward No. 24, Kawardha, District Kabirdham (C.G.)

... Applicants

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Lorami, District Mungeli (C.G.)

... Respondent

(Cause title is taken from CIS)

For Applicants	:	Mr. Ashutosh Trivedi, Advocate
For State/Respondent	:	Mr. Sumit Singh, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Order on Board

26/10/2026

1. Applicants have preferred this application under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory

bail as they apprehends their arrest in connection with Crime No. 361/2026 registered at Police Station- Lorami, District Mungeli (C.G.) for offence punishable under Sections 74, 296, 115(2), 351(3), 191(2) and 331(6) of BNS.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 27.08.2026, the complainant/victim lodged a written complaint at the Lormi police station that on the intervening night of 20/21.08.2026, 04-05 people entered her house, caught her with wrong intentions, gagged her mouth and took her to the terrace. Suddenly, during the scuffle, her hand slipped and she shouted to her mother, when her mother woke up, hearing her shout, her brothers came up to the terrace and the applicants attacked her brothers with a sharp weapon. During this, someone attacked her on the front part of her head, due to which the victim/complainant suffered an injury on her forehead above her left eye. After the above incident, some people of the village came near their house, then her brothers told the people of the village about the attack on their house by 20-25 people over the dispute of buying a trailer vehicle, beating them and trying to take them away, in which applicant No. 01 Ritesh, son of Dilip Chandravanshi, resident of Dharampura, applicant no. 02 Nilesh, Amit, Anuj, Arjun, Durgesh and others were involved. On the above written complaint of the victim/complainant, aforementioned crime was registered against the applicants and others by Lormi police station.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicants have not committed any offence as alleged and applicants were falsely implicated in the crime in question. He contended that the father of the applicant sold one trailer vehicle to Kamta Prasad Kashyap/brother of the complainant and has not paid the entire sale consideration. When the demand is made applicants were called by the family members of the complainant and when some dispute arose, a false report was lodged by the complainant against the applicants. He also contended that in the incident applicant No.2 also suffered injuries over his person, i.e. fracture on right ankle, therefore, it can not be said that the applicants ares involved in committing the offences as alleged against them. He also submits that there is delay of 5 days in lodging FIR and there is no other criminal antecedent registered against the applicants. Hence, they may be enlarged on bail.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the submission of learned counsel for applicant and would submit that from the diary it is apparent that the applicants entered into house of the complainant in the night at about 01:00 a.m. (midnight) caught hold of the victim/complainant and taken her to another room at top floor in order to outrage her modesty and when resistance is made, some how her face was released, she shouted, thereafter the other family members rushed and have rescued her. He also submits that victim/complainant suffered 2 injuries and Kishori Lal/brother of the complainant suffered one fracture on his elbow and Roshan

also suffered injuries i.e. one swelling and 2 contusions on his person, therefore, the applicants are not entitled for the benefit of the anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the documents enclosed along with bail application.

6. Considering the entirety of the facts and circumstances of the case, submission of learned counsel for the respective parties, nature of allegation, allegation levelled against the applicants, further considering the time in which the alleged incident has taken place, I do not find present to be a fit case to allow this anticipatory bail application of the applicants.

7. Accordingly, this application filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 stands **dismissed**.

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)

JUDGE

Ravi Mandavi