CGHC010413192026 2026:CGHC:46019

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1744 of 2026

1 - Heera Lal Verma S/o Panchu Ram Verma Aged About 37 Years R/o - Thakkar Baba, Ward No. 09 Lodhipara Gudhiyari Bindra Navgarh P.S. Gudhiyari District - Raipur (C.G.)

... Applicant

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station - Patan District - Durg (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. Ashish Gangwani, Advocate along with Mr. Karanjeet Bodhani, Advocate
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. H.A.P.S. Bhatia, Government Advocate

SB: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

ORDER ON BOARD

30/10/2026

1. This is the second anticipatory bail application filed by the applicant. The first anticipatory bail appliation was dismissed as withdrawn in MCRCA No. 1649/2026 vide order dated 06.10.2026.

2. This anticipatory bail application is filed by the applicant under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail, as the applicant is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 157/2021 registered at Police Station – Patan, District – Durg, Chhattisgarh for the offences punishable under Sections 294, 341, 394 506 (B), 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

3. Case of the prosecution in brief is that the complainant lodged report in the concerned police station alleging that, on 29.08.2021 at about 23:45 hrs, the applicant along with other co-accused, near the newly constructed bridge on Patan to Matiya Road under Police Station Patan, District Durg, voluntarily stopped Parthi Yepal Singh and robbed Vivo company V17 mobile, 02 ATM cards of SBI, 01 ATM card of Dena Bank, PAN card, Aadhar card, motorcycle number CG. 07/AJ5338, two scanners, one small printer and Rs. 15,000 cash kept in his purse. Thereafter, the crime was registered in the concerned police station, against which, the applicatn is papprehending his arrest.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent. He has been falsely implicated in the crime. He has not committed any offence as alleged. He submits that other co-accused persons have been acquitted by the learned Trial Court after full-fleged trial and therefore, he may be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Respondent/State opposes the submission made by the counsel for the applicant and would submit that since the date of offence, the applicant is absconding and the charge-sheet was earlier filed against the other co-accused persons mentioining that the applicant is absconding. He submits that the applicant is absconding from last 05 years and thereofre, the benefit of anticipatory bail may not be granted to the applicant.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents enclosed along with the application.

7. On due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegations, submission of counsel for the respective parties, I do not find present to be a fit case to allow this application for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, this anticipatory bail application is **dismissed**.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Dey