



Digitally
signed by
VAISHALI
LUCKY
NAGARIA
Date:
2026.03.02
11:35:09
+0530

2026:CGHC:10532

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 806 of 2026

- Dr. Sant Kumar Namdeo S/o Sunnilal Namdeo Aged About 44 Years
R/o 21 Gram Khaptaha, Panna, Post Birwahi Khaptaha District
Panna (M.P.)

... Applicant

versus

- State of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Bodhghat, Jagdalpur,
District Bastar (C.G.)

... Respondent

(Cause title is taken from Case Information System)

For Applicant	: Mr. Sabyasanchi Bhaduri, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Ms. Monika Thakur, Panel Lawyer
For Objector	Mr. Arpit Agrawal, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

28/02/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this First Bail Application under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail, as he has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 543/2025, registered at Police Station – Bodhghat, District – Jagdalpur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 74, 75 and 78 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).
2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the the victim, a Manager at the SBI Regional Office in Jagdalpur, alleges that the accused, Deputy Manager Dr. Sant Kumar Namdev, began making unwanted

advances toward her and calling her husband when ignored. On October 24, 2025, after the victim told him to stop, the accused allegedly began stalking her, sending midnight messages, and using obscene language. On November 4, 2025, the accused reportedly approached the victim in the office parking lot, grabbed her hand, and touched her inappropriately. Following this, he allegedly blackmailed her, threatening to expose her personal relationships unless she spent a night with him. The victim eventually reported the matter on November 28, 2025, after gaining support from her husband and colleagues.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that prior to the registration of the present FIR, the applicant had already submitted a written complaint dated 24.11.2025 to the Regional Manager of the State Bank of India regarding the alleged misconduct of the complainant and one Prem Kumar. It is further submitted that the applicant also lodged FIR No. 535/2025 on 25.11.2025 against them. It is argued that the present FIR was lodged by the complainant only on 28.11.2025, i.e., three days after the applicant had already approached the authorities. It is further submitted that although the alleged incident is stated to have occurred on 04.11.2025, the complainant approached the police after a delay of 24 days, which remains unexplained. It is thus contended that the present case is a counter-blast to the earlier complaint filed by the applicant. He also submits that applicant is in jail since 11.12.2025 and trial may take some time for its conclusion therefore, he submits that the present applicant is also entitled to be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, appearing for the non - applicant/State, opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the applicant and submits that applicant is a resident of the State of Madhya Pradesh and he has 11 previous criminal antecedents and all are explained in paragraph 4(a) in the bail application.
5. Learned counsel for the Objector also opposes the prayer of bail to the applicant and submits that applicant has 11 previous criminal antecedent, out of which 7 cases are still pending for their conclusion. He also relied the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Neeru Yadav vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another**, reported in, **(2014) 16 SCC 508** and **State of U.P. Through CBI vs. Amarmani Tripathi, with State of U.P. Through CBI vs. Madhumani Tripathi** reported in, **(2005) 8 SCC 21** and one another judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Virupakshappa Gouda and another vs. State of Karnataka** reported in **(2017) 5 SCC 406**. On the strength of the aforesaid judgments, learned counsel for the objector submits that in view of the applicant's criminal history and the settled principles of law, he does not deserve the indulgence of this Court and the bail application is liable to be rejected.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials available on record.
7. Considering the facts & circumstances of the case, submission of learned counsel for the parties, materials available on record, also considering the fact that applicant is in jail since 11.12.2025, looking to his period of detention, I am inclined to grant bail to the present applicant.

8. Let applicant **Dr. Sant Kumar Namdeo**, involved in Crime No. 543/2025, registered at Police Station – Bodhghat, District – Jagdalpur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 74, 75 and 78 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) be released on bail on his furnishing **a personal bond** with **two local sureties** in the like sum to the satisfaction of the court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the trial court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.

(ii) The applicant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the trial court may proceed against him under Section 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(iii) In case, the applicant misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure his presence, proclamation under Section 84 of BNSS. is issued and the applicant fails to appear before the court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against him, in accordance with law, under Section 209 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(iv) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case, (ii) framing of charge and (iii) recording of statement under Section 351 of BNSS. If in the opinion of the trial court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the trial court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

9. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Vaishali