



2026:CGHC:9369

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 418 of 2026

Vivek Verma S/o Shriram Verma Aged About 24 Years Resident of Near Satyanarayan Temple, P.S. Tikrapara, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Appellant

versus

State of Chhattisgarh *through* Station House Officer, Police Station Tikrapara, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent

For the appellant	: Mr. C.R. Sahu & Mr. S.P. Sahu, Advocates
For the State	: Mr. Vinod Tekam, Dy. G.A.

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)

Order on Board

23/02/2026

1. This appeal is filed under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 for grant of regular bail to the appellant who has been arrested in Crime No. 720/2025 registered at P.S. Tikrapara, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G) for the offence punishable under Sections 333, 109, 3(5) of B.N.S. and Sections 25 & 27 of the Arms Act as also Section 3(2)(d) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.



2. By impugned order dated 21.01.2026 passed by the learned Special Judge, SC & ST (PoA) Act, Raipur, District Raipur, the application filed by the appellant for grant of regular bail has been rejected.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 14.09.2025, complainant Ayush Thakur lodged a report stating that on 13.09.2025 in the night at 22.30 O' clock, appellant Vivek Verma along with co-accused Bhavesh Verma and a juvenile offender forcibly entered into his house, abused in filthy language and assaulted his brother Abhijeet Thakur. It is alleged that the applicant Vivek Verma and the juvenile offender caught hold of his brother Abhijeet Thakur whereas co-accused Bhavesh Verma assaulted his brother with a sharp pointed object, due to which, his brother suffered injuries on his neck and other parts of body and was admitted in hospital. On the basis of the said report, crime was registered.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that no seizure has been made from the applicant. There was a simple dispute between the parties and he has not committed the aforesaid offence as projected by the prosecution. He further submits that the main allegation of assault is against co-accused Bhavesh and the juvenile-accused has been bailed out. He submits that the appellant is a student and is in jail since 14.9.2025; till date out of a total 24 prosecution witnesses only 5 have been examined who have not stated anything against the appellant and further there is no immediate possibility of disposal of case, therefore, he may be enlarged on bail, at this stage.

5. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and supports the order of the trial Court. They submit that as per the eye-witness Ayush Thakur, three accused persons forcibly entered into the house of victim, hurled abuses and assaulted the victim with a sharp pointed object, due to which, the victim suffered stab injury on his neck and was admitted in hospital for 7 days. They further submit that the



main witnesses have not yet been examined in this case, therefore, the appellant may not be released on bail at this stage.

6. The victim Abhijeet appears in person before the Court and raised objection to grant bail.

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

8. Having considered the submissions made by the parties and the overall facts situation of the case as also the fact that main witnesses have not been examined till date, I am not inclined to release the appellant on regular bail.

9. However, looking to the custody period of the appellant, the trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as early as possible.

10. Copy of this order be sent to the trial Court for information.

Sd/-

(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge

Rao