SUNITA GOSWAMI
Digitally signed by SUNITA GOSWAMI
DN: cn=SUNITA GOSWAMI, ou=HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, st=Chhattisgarh, c=IN
Date: 2026.11.05 18:46:12 +0530

CGHC010437342026 2026:CGHC:46962

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1865 of 2026

1 - Parmeshwar Rohidas Son Of Shri Bahori Lal Aged About 36 Years Caste - Schedule Caste, R/o Village Bandhapara, Arda, Chhuri, P.S. Banki Mongra, Tahsil - Katghora, District Korba (C.G.)

... Applicant(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through - The Station House Officer, Police Of Police Station Banki Mongra, District Korba (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Suresh Kumar Verma, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Himanshu Yadu, Panel Lawyer

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

Order On Board

05/11/2026

1. Applicant has filed this second 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.187 of 2026 registered at Police Station- Banki Mongra, District- Korba (CG) for offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 296, 3(5), 331(4) and 351(3) of BNS. The earlier bail application of the applicant was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 28.10.2026 in MCRCA No.1739 of 2026.

2. Case of prosecution is that the complainant lodged a report in police station that in SECL Singhali, he was working on the post of Suraksha Pahri. On 22.09.2026, in the night at Shinghali Khadan workshop, he was doing duty with the other person Jagat Ram Yadav, Makhan Yadav, Ramesh Patwa at that time in the night about 8:40 PM, four persons along with the present applicant came with intention to commit theft and when he stopped them, they abused the complainant and threatened to kill him and assaulted by stone thereafter the applicant and other accused run away.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that earlier also, a complaint was lodged against the applicant of similar nature. He submits that the complainant is having personal grievance with the applicant, therefore, he lodged a false complaint. He submits that the applicant is innocent and he has not committed any offence. He contended that learned trial Court has rejected the bail application of the applicant only on presumption, considering that there is a criminal antecedent of applicant of the applicant. He prays that the applicant may be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel would oppose the submissions advanced on behalf of the applicant and submit that the applicant had entered the premises of the SECL Singhali with intention to commit theft and upon seeing this, the complainant- Guard, the applicant along other accused assaulted him with stone and

thereafter ran away. He submits that the incident was seen by the other workers in the premises.

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

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation and further considering that the applicant is involved in similar nature of offence and earlier also the complaint was filed against him, I do not find present to be a fit case to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to applicant.

7. Accordingly, the application is rejected.

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

sunita