CGHC010248202026 2026:CGHC:37055

NAFR

PRAKASH KUMAR Digitally signed by PRAKASH KUMAR Date: 2026.08.19 13:06:30 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 6065 of 2026

Rajiv Vishwakarma S/o Lilaram Vishwakarma, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Rivapara, P.S. City Kotwali, Mungeli, Distt- Mungeli, (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station City Kotwali, Mungeli, Distt- Mungeli (C.G.)

... Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Leekesh Kumar, Advocate
For State/Respondent	:	Ms. Deepa Singh, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Radhakishan Agrawal

Order on Board

19/08/2026

1. This is second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 for grant of regular bail to applicant, who has been arrested in connection with FIR No.508/2025, registered at P.S.- City Kotwali, District Mungeli (C.G.) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 137(2), 87, 64(2)(M) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 4 and 6 of POCSO Act.

2. First bail application of the applicant i.e. MCRC No.3283/2026 was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 21.04.2026.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 16.11.2025, the father of the prosecutrix lodged a missing report at Police Station City Kotwali, Mungeli, stating that the prosecutrix had left home to purchase food items but did not return. During investigation, the prosecutrix was recovered from the possession of the applicant on 28.11.2025. She stated that the applicant had taken her to Raipur and thereafter to Durg, where he kept her in a newly constructed building at Kelabadi and allegedly established physical relations with her on three occasions against her will. On the basis of the above background, the police registered the offence against the applicant.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the victim girl was residing with the applicant for 13 days on her own will. He further submits that the applicant is in jail since 29.11.2025 and trial is likely to take some time, therefore, it is prayed that applicant may be enlarged on bail.

5. Learned State Counsel opposes the bail application filed by the applicant. She further submits that the applicant has abducted/kidnapped the victim (minor) girl who is aged about 16 years only and he has committed sexual intercourse with her multiple times. She further submits that statements of victim (PW-1) and her father (PW-2) have been recorded wherein they have supported the case of the prosecution. As such, the applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

6. In compliance of order dated 08.07.2026, the father of the victim is present through video conferencing from the concerned DLSA, and on being asked, he has raised ‘objection’ to the application filed by the applicant for grant of bail.

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

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, materials available on record, and nature and gravity of the offence, without commenting on merits of the case, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant.

9. Accordingly, the present bail application is rejected.

Sd/-

(Radhakishan Agrawal)
Judge

Prakash