



2026:CGHC:3886



2026:CGHC:3886

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 18 of 2026

1 - Laxminarayan S/o Late Shri Bahoran Lal Yadav Aged About 61 Years R/o Chandaniya Para, Ward No. 08, Shiv Mandir Gali, Tah. Janjgir, Dist- Janjgir-Champa (C.G.) Presently Posted As Assistant Superintendent, District Office Sarangarh, Dist- Sarangarh-Bilaigarh (C.G.)

--- Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through S.H.O., P.S. Dabhra, Dist.- Sakti (C.G.)

--- Respondent

MCRCA No. 33 of 2026

1 - Padmlochan Sidar S/o Shri Rajkumar Sidar Aged About 55 Years R/o Vill.- Khairakhurd, Post- Salhe, Tah. Chandrapur, Distt.- Sakti (C.G.) Presently Posted As Patwari Halka No. 01, Patwari Office Vill. - Girgira, Tah. Chandrapur, Distt.- Sakti (C.G.)

---Applicant

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through- S.H.O., P.S. Dabhra, Distt.- Sakti (C.G.)

--- Respondent

For Applicants : Mr. Ravindra Sharma, Adv.

For Respondent/State : Mr. Sabyasachi Choubey, Adv.

For objector/complainant : Mr. Punit Ruparel, Adv.

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi****Order on Board****22-1-2026**

1. Since both the above applications for grant of anticipatory bail arise out of the same crime number of same police station, therefore, they are being heard analogously and decided by this common order.
2. The applicants have preferred these bail applications under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail, as they apprehend their arrest in connection with Crime No. 323/2021 registered at Police Station Dabhra, Distt. Sakti (CG) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B and 201 of the IPC.
2. Brief facts of the case are that the complainants Dolanarayan Patel and Devendra Kumar Patel lodged written complaint before the Collector, Distt. Janjgir-Champa that, revenue officers have mutated their land in the name of Shivnandan, Ghasilal, Hemprasad, Laxminarayan, Devnarayan and Khagshwar though they have not sold the land to them. On the basis of written complaint, an FIR was registered and during inquiry, the applicants, who are Patwari and Kanungo, have been implicated in the case.
3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that, allegation against the present applicants is that, they in collusion with other co-accused persons manipulated the revenue record from 2012 to 2017 by mentioning back date as the year 1994 to 1996. He also submits that, no concrete documentary evidence has been collected by the police to show the fact that, the applicant Laxminarayan Yadav who was working as Kanungo and Padmalochan Sidar who was working as Patwari, were posted in Janjgir District at the fateful time, rather only on the basis of assumption, the applicants have been implicated in



the case. Hence, he prays that both the applicants who are government servant, be granted benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel submits that, the applicants who were posted as Kanungo and Patwari in collusion with other accused persons fabricated the revenue record by making entry on the basis of invalid documents fraudulently. He also submits that, pertaining to the issue, the Collector had got conducted enquiry from a team of 4 officials. In that inquiry report also, it has been reported that explanation should be sought from the applicants as their role is found to be suspicious. He prays that, instant applications for anticipatory bail may be rejected.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant also supported the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the State.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

7. Allegation against the applicants is that, they manipulated the revenue documents by making entry from back date. Alleged fabricated entry is said to be made between the year 2012 to 2017. In absence of any concrete document that, at the alleged time of fabricating manipulation in revenue record, the applicants were posted in District Janjgir - Champa and they were in-charge of the said record; and no specific finding has been given by the enquiry team on said count, further the applicants are government employees, hence I feel inclined to allow the applications for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicants.

8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail applications are allowed and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicants in connection with the aforesaid offence, they shall be released on bail by the officer arresting them on



executing each of them a personal bond in a sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the officer arresting them or the concerned investigating officer. The applicants shall also abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) that they shall make themselves available for interrogation before the investigating officer as and when required;
- (ii) that they 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or any police officer.
- (iii) that they shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and
- (iv) that they shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial;
- (v) that in case of change of address they will inform new address to investigating agency.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
JUDGE