CGHC010237392026 2026:CGHC:32904

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 1484 of 2026

- Dhananjay Giri S/o Vijay Giri Aged About 25 Years R/o Namnakala, Behind Sant Harkeval School, Ambikapur, District Surguja Chhattisgarh

--- Appellant

PRIYANKA VERMA Digitally signed by PRIYANKA VERMA Date: 2026.07.30 16:25:36 +0530

versus

- State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Gandhinagar, District Surguja Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent

CRA No. 1635 of 2026

- Motiram Yadav S/o Dashrath Ram Aged About 45 Years R/o Rampur, P.S. Manipur, Ambikapur, Distt. Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

---Appellant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, P.S. Gandhinagar, Distt. Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent

For Appellants	:	Mr. Nishi Kant Sinha and Mr. Shakti Raj Sinha, Advocates along with Mr. Pavas Sharma, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Ms. Swati R. Gupta, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Radhakishan Agrawal

Order on Board

30/07/2026

1. Since both the criminal appeals arise out of the same Crime No.369/2025

registered at Police Station- Gandhinagar, District- Surguja (Ambikapur) (C.G.), they are being heard together and disposed of by this common order.

2. Both these criminal appeals filed by the appellants under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, the Act, 1989) for grant of regular bail to them, who have been arrested in connection with Crime No.369/2025 registered at Police Station – Gandhinagar, District Surguja (Ambikapur) (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 140(2), 140(3) & 61(2) of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (for short, the BNS) and Sections 3(2)(v) & 3(2)(v-a) of the Act, 1989.

3. As per the prosecution case, the appellants/accused, along with co-accused namely Raju @ Maharaj, Bahadur Jaiswal, Vicky @ Purab Kushwaha, Karan Vishwakarma and other persons, allegedly made a plan together and in furtherance of their common intention, abducted the complainant- Shankar Dayal Ravi, knowing that he belonged to a Scheduled Caste. It is alleged that, due to an earlier land dispute and for the purpose of recovering money, they kept the complainant confined, assaulted him, and demanded ransom from him. Based upon the complaint by the complainant/victim, the present appellants were arrested by the Police and offence under the above sections has been registered against them.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants have not committed any offence and have been falsely implicated in the present case. They further submit that the victim/complainant and his wife were examined as PW-1 and PW-2 before the learned trial Court, but they have turned hostile and not supported the case of the prosecution. They also

submit that there is a previous land dispute between the parties, on account of which, the appellants have been falsely implicated. They further submit that appellant- Dhananjay Giri is in jail since 28.06.2025 and appellant- Motiram Yadav is in jail since 27.06.2025 i.e. for more than one year and the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time, therefore, it is prayed that both the appeals may be allowed and the appellants may be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the appeals for grant of regular bail.

6. With the aid of concerned DLSA, complainant is present through virtual mode, and has raised no objection to grant bail to the appellants.

7. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.

8. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of the case, the fact that no objection has been raised by the complainant, the detention period of the appellants, and further considering that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the present appeals deserve to be allowed and that the appellants are entitled to be released on regular bail. Accordingly, both the criminal appeals are allowed.

9. It is directed that, in the event of the appellants executing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- each with one surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, they shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

(i) they 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 fact to the Court,

(ii) they shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

Sd/-

(Radhakishan Agrawal)
Judge

Priyanka