CGHC010401412026 2026:CGHC:44595

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Digitally signed by SIDDHANT TAMRAKAR
Date: 2026.10.15 19:18:29 +0530

MCRC No. 9719 of 2026

- Pulastnandan Sahu S/o Lt. Gaya Ram Sahu Aged About 42 Years R/o Village Bagdai, P/s- Gurur, District- Balod, Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through S.H.O. Gurur, District Balod (C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Sudhanshu Singh, Advocate

For State : Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Saini, Dy. Government Advocate

---

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

15.10.2026

1. This is the second 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. 62/2026 registered at Police Station Gurur, District Balod (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 296, 351(3), 118(1), 118(2), 109(1) of BNS.

2. Earlier, first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 5370 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 27.07.2026.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 17.03.2026, complainant and

her husband were passing through the applicant's field to collect gram and mustard stalks. The applicant allegedly objected to their passage, abused them and assaulted her husband on the head with a thick wooden stake (khuta), causing serious injuries. Thereafter, Police has registered aforesaid offence against the present applicant.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant would submit that after rejection of first bail application, only 13 witnesses have been examined out of 23 witnesses. He would further submit that the present applicant is in jail since 01.02.2026 and trial may take some time for its conclusion. He would submit that on the ground of delay in trial, instant application may be allowed.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail application. He would submit that first bail application was rejected on merits. He would further submit that out of 22 witnesses 13 have already been examined, and therefore, ground of delay is not available to the applicant. He would contend that instant application deserves to be rejected.

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

7. Having considered facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of allegations levelled against the applicant, fact that applicant allegedly assaulted the complainant on head with a wooden stake (*khuta*), causing a fracture of the left parietal bone, and further fact that first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 5370 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 27.07.2026 and 13 out of 23 prosecution witnesses have already been examined, therefore, ground of delay in trial is also not available to the applicant, I am not inclined to allow this application.

8. Accordingly, this bail application fails and is hereby **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant