CGHC010426142026 2026:CGHC:46334

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1829 of 2026

Smt. Kanti Bai Sahu Wife Of Devprasad Sahu Aged About 50 Years Resident Of Village - Nirjam, Police Station And District - Mungeli (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station - City Kotwali, Mungeli, District - Mungeli (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. K.L. Sahu, Advocate
For State	:	Dr. Surendra Dewangan, Panel Lawyer

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

Order On Board

02/11/2026

1. Applicant has filed this application under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short "*BNSS*") for grant of anticipatory bail as she is apprehending her arrest in connection with Crime No.225 of 2026 registered at Police Station- City Kotwali, Mungeli, District- Mungeli (CG) for offence punishable under Sections 191 (2), 296, 115 (2), 351 (3), 117 (2) of BNS and Sections 25 & 27 of the Arms Act.

2. Case of prosecution, in brief, is that the on 25.07.2026, an altercation took place between the complainant – Vanshraj

Digitally signed by PRAVEEN KUMAR SINHA
Date: 2026.11.03 14:43:10 +0530

Singh Parihar and one Devprasad Sahu near government well of the Village. During the said altercation, applicant along with other co-accused persons also assaulted the complainant upon which, he ran to the house of his uncle Manoj Singh Parihar. It is further alleged that when the complainant along with his grandfather Keshav Singh Parihar went to the house of the applicant, he along with other co-accused persons abused, threatened them and again assaulted the complainant with wooden stick. Based on the aforesaid allegation, crime was registered under the aforementioned crime number in connection of which applicant is apprehending her arrest.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent. She has been falsely implicated in the crime. She has not committed any offence as alleged. According to the allegations made in the F.I.R., initially there was some dispute with Devprasad Sahu and thereafter, the other co-accused persons including the applicant had also joined and there was a free-fight between the two family members. He contended that according to the FIR, allegation of assault is against the co-accused persons who have assaulted by means of wooden stick. Similarly placed accused person – Jitendra Sahu has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 13.10.2026 passed in MCRCA No. 1699 of 2026. Case of the applicant is on similar footing. Hence, she 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 as per allegation, the applicant also participated in the quarrel and in the quarrel, Vanshraj Suffered three injuries including two contusions and one fracture on the collar bone. However, he does dispute submission of counsel for applicant, that the case of applicant to be similar to the case of Jitendra Sahu.

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

6. On due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation, submission of learned counsel for the parties, the fact that initially the quarrel took place with Devprasad Sahu and as per allegation, the other family members joined them, applicant is a lady, she is having no criminal antecedent, without commenting anything on merits of the case, I am inclined to allow this anticipatory bail application.

7. Accordingly, application is allowed and it is directed that in the event of arrest of applicant in connection with the aforesaid crime, she shall be released on anticipatory bail by the Officer arresting her on her 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