



2026:CGHC:12625

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 1534 of 2026

1 - Satyanarayan Chorati S/o Shri Late Ramdhari Chorati Aged About 31 Years
R/o Sewari, Police Station- Rajpur, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj C.G.

... **Applicant(s)**

versus

1 - The State Of Chhattisgarh Through S H O, Police Station- Rajpur, District
Balrampur-Ramanujganj C.G.

---**Non-applicants**

For applicants	:	Mr. Divyanand Patel, Advocate
For-Non-applicant	:	Mr. Suresh Tandon, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Arvind Kumar Verma, Judge
Order on Board

17/03/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this **Second Bail Application** under Section 483 of B.N.S.S. in connection with Crime No. 25/2025, registered at Police Station Rajpur, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2), 87 and 67 of BNS and Section 4 & 6 of the POCSO.
2. Earlier bail application was dismissed on merits 11.11.2025 vide MCRC No. 8001/2025.
3. Prosecution case in brief is that 04.02.2025 mother of the prosecutrix

has lodged a written report against the applicant stating that he has developed physical relations with her daughter who is aged about 14 years, on the pretext of marriage. Based on the said complaint offence was registered against the applicant and was arrested.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the allegations levelled against the applicant are wholly false, baseless and fabricated, and no offence, as alleged, has been committed by him.
5. It is further submitted that the applicant has neither participated in nor committed any act which would attract the ingredients of the offences alleged against him. The prosecution has failed to collect any cogent and reliable evidence to prima facie establish the involvement of the applicant in the alleged crime. Learned counsel further submits that the statement of the victim has already been recorded before the learned Trial Court, wherein in Paragraph No. 21, she has categorically stated that the applicant has not committed rape upon her and that the report was lodged at the instance of her stepfather. This material contradiction goes to the root of the prosecution case and renders it highly doubtful. Learned counsel further submits that the applicant is in judicial custody since 04.03.2025 and the trial is likely to take considerable time for its conclusion. There is no likelihood of the applicant absconding or tampering with the prosecution evidence, if he is released on bail. On these grounds, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to enlarge the applicant on bail.
6. Notice issued to the victim has duly been served, however, no one appeared on behalf of the victim. In such circumstances, Ms. Bhavika

Kotecha, Advocate, who is present in the Court is appointed as amicus curiae to assist the Court on behalf of the victim.

7. After going through the documents, Ms. Bhavika Kotecha, Advocate, appointed as amicus curiae, opposes the prayer for grant of bail for the applicant
8. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application.
9. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary produced by the learned counsel for the State.
10. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence and further considering the fact of the case, I do not find any change of circumstances to reconsider this repeat application for grant of bail and to release the applicant on bail, therefore, at this stage, the aforesaid bail application of applicant is **rejected**.
11. However, this Court hope and trust that the trial Court shall make an earnest endeavour to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible as if there is no legal impediment.
12. Office is directed to provide a certified copy of this order to the trial Court for necessary information.

Sd/-

**(Arvind Kumar Verma)
Judge**