



2026:CGHC:13675



2026:CGHC:13675

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****Criminal Appeal No.619 of 2026**

Chandrabhan Yadav S/o Shri Durg Vijay Yadav Aged About 27
Years R/o Village Shahpur, Post Sema, Thana Dharwara, District
Aajamgarh (U.P.) **... Appellant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police
Station Chhal, District Raigarh (C.G.) **... Respondent**

For Appellant :Shri Rajendra Patel, Advocate.

For Respondent/State :Shri Amit Verma, PL.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal**Judgment on Board****23.03.2026**

1. This Criminal Appeal under Section 14A(2) of the Scheduled
Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989



(henceforth 'the SC/ST Act') is filed by the Appellant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.11/2026 registered at Police Station Chhal, District Raigarh for the offence under Section 64(2) (m) of BNS as also under Sections 3(1)(2) and 3(2)(v)(a) of the SC/ST Act.

2. That, the prosecution case in brief is that the complainant lodged a report alleging that after her marriage in March 2024, she was neglected by her husband, leading to the death of her child and deterioration of her health and thereafter, she started residing alone at her maternal home. It is alleged that in April 2025, the Applicant came into contact with her and despite knowing her caste, induced her on the pretext of marriage and on 06.04.2025, he allegedly established physical relations with her by deceit and thereafter continued to sexually exploit her by threatening to make her obscene photos and videos viral until 28.01.2026. Based on these allegations, the aforesaid offences have been registered against the present Appellant. Hence this Appeal.

3. Learned counsel for the Appellant submits that the Appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case and has neither committed nor participated in the alleged offence. It is contended that the FIR was lodged on 02.02.2026, i.e., after an unexplained delay of about 10 months from the date of the alleged incident. It is further submitted that the complainant is a married



major woman and it is improbable that she could have been subjected to such acts for a prolonged period without her consent. It is also submitted that initially the offence was registered only under Section 64(2)(m) of BNS and subsequently, provisions of the SC/ST Act have been added only to aggravate the case. Lastly, it is submitted that the Appellant has no criminal antecedents, he is a young man aged about 27 years, who is in custody since 03.02.2026 and the trial is likely to take considerable time, therefore, he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Per contra, learned State Counsel strongly opposes the bail application and submits that the Appellant is a married person and after administering some intoxicating substance, made the complainant unconscious and established physical relations with her and also captured her obscene photographs. It is further submitted that the investigation is still ongoing and the charge-sheet has not yet been filed, therefore, the Appellant does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. Victim appearing through DLSA, Gharghoda, also objected to the grant of bail to the Appellant.

6. Having considered the submissions of learned Counsel for the parties, the material available on record along with the fact that the investigation is still ongoing and the charge-sheet has not yet been



2026:CGHC:13675

filed, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the Appellant, at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the Appeal is **rejected**.

Sd/-
(**Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal**)
Judge

Priya