CGHC010436662026 2026:CGHC:46940

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 10543 of 2026

1 - Deepak Yadav @ Deepak Son Of Ajay Yadav Aged About 23 Years Resident Of Village Tangarmahri, P.S. Balrampur, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.) (Mother Pramila Wrongly Mentioned In Impugned Order)

2 - Surya Yadav @ Surya Prakash Yadav S/o Ajay Aged About 20 Years R/o Balrampur, P.S. Balrampur, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.)

... Applicants

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Pasta, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj,(C.G.) **... Respondent**

For Applicants	**:**	Mr. Vijay Kumar Sahu, Advocate
For State/Respondent	**:**	Mr. Avinash Singh, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Order on Board

05/11/2026

1. Applicants have filed this **first bail** application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicants who have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 0044/2026 registered at Police Station – Pasta, District Balrampur-

Ramanujganj (C.G.), for the offences under Sections 221, 351(2), 308(2), 356(3) & 3(5) of the BNS.

2. The prosecution story, in brief, is that the complainant, Rukman Barik, who is posted as an Assistant Teacher and is presently working as the In-charge Headmaster at Government Primary School, Putsu, submitted a written complaint alleging that, for the past 8–10 days, the accused Shravan Yadav and his associates had been repeatedly harassing her through phone calls and demanding money for a foundation established by them. It is further alleged that on 25.08.2026, at about 1:00 p.m., the accused persons, namely Shravan Yadav, Deepak Yadav and Surya Yadav, unauthorizedly entered the school premises and started videographing without obtaining any permission. They allegedly disrupted the teaching activities, behaved abusively and threatened that, if an amount of Rs.10,000/- was not paid to them, they would upload the video on the internet. It is further alleged that the accused persons stood outside the classroom, shouted loudly, continued video graphing and threatening the complainant and others, thereby frightening the students and disturbing the peaceful and educational atmosphere of the school.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the allegation against the applicants are that the applicant and another person were extorting Rs.10,000/- for the foundation. He further submits that the applicants entered the school and found certain irregularities, which have been brought to light, and

on that basis, a false complaint has been lodged against them. The applicants were arrested on 14.10.2026, and no further custodial interrogation is required, therefore, they may be enlarged on regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the applicants and another person unauthorizedly entered the school premises and thereafter, under threat, demanded money.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the allegations, submissions made by learned counsel for the respective parties, no further custodial interrogation may be required, trial is likely to take some time, without commenting on the merits of the case, I am inclined to allow this application for grant of bail.

7. Accordingly, bail application is **allowed**. It is directed that the applicants shall be released on regular bail, upon furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety each in like sum to the satisfaction of the Court on the conditions that-

> (a) The applicants shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the trial court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.
> (b) The applicants shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the trial court may proceed against him under Section 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
> (c) In case, the applicants misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure his presence,

proclamation under Section 84 of BNSS. is issued and the applicant fails to appear before the court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against him, in accordance with law, under Section 209 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(d) The applicants shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case, (ii) framing of charge and (iii) recording of statement under Section 351 of BNSS. If in the opinion of the trial court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the trial court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against them in accordance with law.

8. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
JUDGE

vaibhav