



2026:CGHC:12713

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 2149 of 2026**

1 - Murti Bai Rajwade W/o Late Sopadi Lal Rajwade, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Gram Maani, Tahsil And District- Surajpur (C.G.).

... Applicant**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Station House Officer, Surajpur, District- Surajpur (C.G.).

... Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr. T.K. Jha, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Mr. Manish Kashyap, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal**Order on Board****17/03/2026**

1. The accused/applicant has moved this **First** bail application under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for releasing her on regular bail during trial in connection with Crime No. 521/2025 registered at Police Station – Surajpur, District – Surajpur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1) of IPC.
2. The prosecution story, in short, is that the deceased, Sopadi Lal Rajwade, lived with his wife, Murti Bai (appellant/accused), daughter Priya Rajwade, and son Sameer Rajwade. On 05.08.2025, Sopadi Lal returned home at 10 pm and had a quarrel with his wife. The next morning i.e., 06.08.2025 at

about 5:00 am, while Sopadi Lal was sleeping, his wife allegedly poured petrol on him and set him on fire using a matchstick. Thereafter, Sopadi Lal was treated in Surajpur and Ambikapur, but he died on the way to Raipur. The investigation revealed that the accused and the deceased had a quarrels on the previous night, and the appellant/accused was arrested and a case under Section 103(1) of the BNS has been registered against her.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the crime in question. He further submits that the entire prosecution case is based on circumstantial evidence and there is no direct eyewitness account of the alleged incident of pouring petrol or setting the deceased on fire. He next submits that the deceased was alive for a considerable period and was taken to Surajpur, Ambikapur, and thereafter referred to Raipur; however, no dying declaration was recorded, which creates serious doubt in the prosecution story. The applicant is a lady and has two minor children; she has no criminal antecedents and has been in jail since 28.09.2025, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Therefore, considering all these facts, the present applicant may be released on bail.
4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application and submits that out of 13 witnesses only 06 have been examined till date and several important witnesses remain to be examined, therefore, at this stage, the applicant should not be enlarged on bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the offence, the material collected and available on record against the applicant and the fact that the important witnesses i.e., Priya and Samir who are the children of the applicant and deceased, are still remaining for examination, at this stage, I am not inclined to release the applicant on bail.
7. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is **rejected**.
8. However, considering the fact that the applicant is in jail since 28.09.2025. It is an exceptional case, therefore, concerned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as early as possible.
9. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

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

Sourabh P.