



2026:CGHC:10139

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 242 of 2026

1 - Raghavendra Dhivar @ Jadu S/o Shri Ramesh Dhivar Aged About 25 Years,
Resident of Village Baima, Daihanpara, P.S. Sarkanda, Tahsil Beltara, District
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Koni District
- Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... Non-applicant

(Cause title taken from Case Information System)

For Applicant : Mr. Pawan Kumar Kashyap, Advocate.

For State/Non-applicant : Mr. Jai Prakash Tiwari and Mr. Vikhyat Arora, Panel
Lawyers.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, J.
Order on Board

26-02-2026

1. The present application under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (in short 'B.N.S.S., 2023') has been filed by the applicant for grant of anticipatory bail as he is apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.593/2025 registered at P.S. Koni, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh for the offence under Section 112 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (in short 'B.N.S.') and Section 3(2) of Gambling Prohibition Act (wrongly mentioned in Annexure A/1 as 3(5), as mentioned in the petition).

2. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant was not present on the spot and his name has only come in the memorandum statement of

the co-accused persons. In fact, he was not present on the spot and he has been falsely implicated in the offence. Except the memorandum statement of the co-accused persons nothing is there against him to implicate in the offence. There is no criminal antecedent against him. The offence is triable by Judicial Magistrate First Class. Therefore, he has filed his anticipatory bail application.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes and submitted that while conducting raid by the police, the present applicant fled away from the place which has been disclosed by the other accused persons in their memorandum statement and his name has come in the memorandum statement of other accused persons that the present applicant is also one of the person who was playing gambling by cards on the spot. Therefore, he is not entitled for anticipatory bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.

5. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, considering the nature of allegation and the material collected during the investigation, further considering that the conduct of the applicant at the time when police party conducted raid, the present applicant fled away from the place, I am not inclined to release the applicant on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, his anticipatory bail application is **rejected**.

Sd/-

(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)

Judge