



2026:CGHC:14775

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 1957 of 2026

Bhuwan Paikra S/o Late Khemsai Paikra Aged About 20 Years R/o Village Raisari, Police Chowki Chendra, Police Station Jhilmili, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.

... **Applicant**

versus

State of Chhattisgarh *through* the Station House Officer, Police Station Jhilmili, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.

... **Respondent**

For the applicant : Mr. Sanjeev Verma,

For the State : Mr. Sunita Manikpuri, Government Advocate

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)

Order on Board

30.03.2026

1. This is first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant in Crime No. 129/2024 registered at Police Station Jhilmili, District Surajpur (CG) for the offences under Sections 103(1) of the BNS, 2023.

2. As per the prosecution case, on 15.11.2024 complainant Manrakhan Paikra lodged a complaint to the effect that on 15.11.2024, Khemsai was irrigating potatoes in his field and at about 2.00 p.m., when he was quarreling with his wife sushila, his younger son Bhuvan Paikra (the present applicant) brought an Axe from home

and hit his father on head saying that he was always quarreling in the house and due to serious head injuries, the deceased fell down and died on the spot. On the said report, crime was registered and the applicant was arrested.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that P.W.1 Sushila, wife of deceased and P.W.2 Satyam Paikra, son of deceased, in their court statements have turned hostile to the prosecution case. The eye-witnesses are brothers of the deceased and there was a land dispute between the deceased and eye-witnesses, therefore, in order to grab the land of deceased, the applicant has been falsely implicated. On the date of incident, the deceased was in drunken condition, due to which, he might have fallen. He submits that the applicant is in jail since 16.11.2024; till date out of a total 17 witnesses, only 2 have been examined and there is no immediate possibility of disposal of case, therefore, he may be enlarged on bail.

4. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposes the bail application and submits that there are two eye witnesses to the incident namely Ramdhani and Manrakhan Paikra and their court statements have not yet been recorded.

5. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties as also the fact that the eye-witnesses have not been examined, I am not inclined to release the applicant on regular bail. Accordingly, this bail application is rejected.

6. However, looking to the long custody period of the applicant, the trial Court is directed to conclude the trial as early as possible preferably within a period 5 months from today.

7. Registry shall send a copy of this order to the trial Court for necessary information.

Sd/-

(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge

Rao