CGHC010349592026 2026:CGHC:44808

NAFR

NIRMALA RAO

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8831 of 2026

1 - Hira Lal Dahire @ Sonu Dahire S/o Bharat Dahire Aged About 31 Years R/o Ward No. 10, Bairagpara, Pandariya, P.S. And Tehsil Pandariya, Distt. Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. Pandariya, Distt. Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Shyam Kumar, Advocate
For Non-applicant	:	Mr. Vivek Sharma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order On Board

16.10.2026

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.43/2026 registered at Police Station Pandariya, District Kabirdham (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 296, 351(3), 331(6), 324 & 119(1) of BNS.

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the present applicant trespassed into the complainant's house, abused and assaulted the complainant and his family members. In the said incident, Mohd. Safiq sustained an injury to his arm and a laceration in the parietal region of his head. Thereafter, the police registered the aforesaid offence against the present applicant.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He would further submit that the charge-sheet has already been filed and that the applicant has been in jail since 19.2.2026. He would also submit that, as per the MLC report, the injuries sustained by the injured person are simple in nature. He would, therefore, pray for grant of bail to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail application and submit that the applicant has as many as 26 criminal antecedents, registered in the years 2015, 2020, 2021, 2023, 2024, 2025 and 2026. He would further submit that the applicant has disclosed only 12 out of the 26 criminal antecedents. He would, therefore, submit that, considering the criminal history of the present applicant, the bail application deserves to be dismissed.

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

6. Having considered the fact that the applicant has disclosed only 12 criminal antecedents without specifying the status of those cases and has failed to disclose the remaining 14 criminal antecedents, a perusal

of the chart detailing the criminal antecedents in Part-D reveals that the cases were registered in the years 2015, 2020, 2021, 2023, 2024, 2025 and 2026, which indicates that the applicant is a habitual offender. Therefore, I am not inclined to allow the bail application, and the same is accordingly rejected.

7. Accordingly, the instant bail application is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Nimmi