



SHUBHAM
SINGH
RAGHUVANSHI

Digitally signed
by SHUBHAM
SINGH
RAGHUVANSHI
Date:
2026.02.19
10:41:28 +0530



2026:CGHC:8721

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 1357 of 2026

Satish Kursunghe S/o Vasudev Kursunghe Aged About 34 Years Resident Of
Kandrapara, Police Station Dongargarh, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station
Dongargarh, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
... Respondent

(Cause-title is taken from CIS)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Anil Tawadkar, Adv.
For Respondent/State	:	Ms. Sunita Manikpuri, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal

Order On Board

18/02/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this 1st bail application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita Act 2023 for grant of regular bail as he is arrested in connection with crime No. 195/2025, registered at Police Station – Dongargarh, District- Rajnandgaon (C.G.) for offence punishable under Section 103(1) & 115(1) of BNS.
2. The prosecution's case, in short, is that on 04.05.2025, over some dispute, the applicant assaulted Sanjay Uike and complainant Mithun Yadav with a bamboo stick due to which the complainant sustained injuries and Sajay Uike died on the way to the hospital. Based on

above, offence has been registered against the applicant and he was arrested on 06.05.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the crime in question. He further submits that out of 18 prosecution witnesses, 7 have been examined till date and they all have been turned hostile including the eye-witnesses Shankar (PW-1) and Mithun (PW-3). The applicant is in jail since 06.05.2025 and the trial is likely to take time to be finalized, therefore, it is prayed that the applicant may be enlarged on bail.
4. Per contra, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the bail application and submits that there was named FIR against the applicant, the bamboo stick has been seized from him on his memorandum. Therefore, looking to the nature of offence, the applicant may not be released on bail.
5. I have heard learned Counsel appearing for the parties and perused the material available on record.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and evidence collected by the prosecution against the applicant, without commenting on merits of the case, I am not inclined to release the applicant on bail.
7. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected**.
8. However, considering the applicant's detention period, the Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and ensure it is concluded as early as possible, preferably within a period of 4 months from receipt of this order.

Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge