CGHC010329702026 2026:CGHC:44682

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 7864 of 2026

1 - Naman Soni S/o Umesh Soni Aged About 21 Years R/o Gaurinagar, Outpost Chikhali, P.S. Kotwali, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

… Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through S.H.O P.S. Basantpur, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

... Non-applicant

For Applicant	:	Mr. T.K. Jha, Senior Advocate with Mr. Parth Kumar Jha, Advocate
For Non-applicant /State	:	Ms. Ankita Shukla, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

15/10/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this First Bail Application under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 328/2026, registered at Police Station Basantpur, District – Rajnandgaon (C.G.) for offence punishable under Sections 74 and 308 of BNS and Section 8 of POCSO Act.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, mother of the victim filed a written complaint alleging that her minor daughter, aged about 15 years, was acquainted with the applicant and for the last 8-9 months, the applicant deceived her, coaxed her, trapped her in the web of his love, molested her and mentally exploited her and by threatening and blackmailing the victim, started asking for gold jewellery from home, which the victim, out of fear, has been giving by taking the gold items from the house for the last several months and thereafter, the applicant has mortgaged the said gold jewellery items. On the basis of the said complaint, police registered FIR against the applicant for the aforesaid offence.

3. Mr. T.K. Jha, learned counsel for the applicant, would argue that false allegation of molestation has been levelled against the applicant as the applicant and the victim were in a love affair and the relationship between them was consensual in nature. He would further contend that in her statement under Section 183 of BNSS, the victim has categorically stated that the applicant was in dire need of money and therefore, both of them had mortgaged the jewellery items in the market and there is no allegation of extortion, etc. With regard to criminal antecedents, he would submit that the applicant has two previous criminal antecedents registered in the year 2025, however, none of them are of similar nature. He would lastly submit that the investigation has been completed and charge-sheet has already been filed and the applicant is in jail since 17/07/2026 and since conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time, thus, the appellant be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, Ms. Ankita Shukla, learned counsel appearing for the non-applicant/State, would oppose the bail application and submit that the applicant trapped the minor victim in his web of love and blackmailed her into giving him gold ornaments from her home and thereafter, mortgaged the said gold ornaments in the market. She would further submit that the applicant has two live criminal antecedents registered in the year 2025 for offence punishable under Sections 296, 115(2), 351(2), 191(2) and 127(2) of BNS, therefore, he is not liable to be released on bail.

5. The parents of the victim appeared before this Court through video conferencing from the concerned District Legal Services Authority (DLSA) and made serious objection in grant of bail to the applicant.

6. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary as well as the material available on record.

7. Taking consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offence, particularly considering that though the appellant has two live criminal antecedents registered in the year 2025 but none of them are of similar nature and also looking to the fact that in her statement under Section 183 of BNSS, the victim has made it very clear that she herself provided the gold jewellery to the applicant; further having considered the fact that the investigation is complete and charge-sheet has already been submitted; the applicant is in custody since 17/07/2026 and since conclusion of trial would take considerable time, this Court, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, is of the considered view that a fit case for grant of regular bail is made out.

Accordingly, the bail application filed by the applicant is **allowed**.

8. It is directed that in the event of the applicant executing a personal bond for a sum of **Rs.50,000/-** with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail, on following conditions :-

   (i) he 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) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, and

   (iii) he shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

9. The observation made herein-above is for the purpose of deciding this bail application only, the trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Harneet