CGHC010405242026 2026:CGHC:44593

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

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

MCRC No. 9831 of 2026

- Priyanshu Bole S/o Arun Kumar Bole Aged About 25 Years R/o Near Gurudawara, Dayalband, Police Station City Kotwali, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Torwa, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Abhishek Kahndelwal, Advocate
For State : Ms. Ankita Sukla, Panel Lawyer

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. 181/2026 registered at Police Station Torwa, District Bilaspur (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 296, 3(5), 351(3), 118(2), 109(1) of BNS.

2. Earlier, first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 5165 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 17.06.2026.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 02.04.2026 at about 19:10 hours, a dispute arose between the applicant and injured Suraj Sahu. It is

alleged that the applicant along with co-accused Sahil Sonkar, Suresh and Vaibhav, abused and threatened the victim and the applicant assaulted him with a sharp-edged weapon, causing injuries to his stomach, head, back and other vital parts of the body. 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, 3 witnesses have been examined out of 12 witnesses and they have not supported the case of prosecution. He would further submit that applicant is in jail since 05.04.2026, 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. She would submit that first bail application was rejected on merits. She would further submit that out of 12 witnesses 03 have already been examined, and therefore, ground of delay is not available to the applicant. She 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 is alleged to have assaulted the injured Suraj Sahu with a sharp-edged weapon, causing injuries to his stomach, head, back and other vital parts of the body, and further fact that first bail application i.e. MCRC No. 5165 of 2026 was rejected on merits vide order dated 17.06.2026 and 03 out of 12 prosecution witnesses have been examined, therefore, the trial is in progress and ground

of delay in trial is not made out, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant.

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

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

$iddhant