



2026:CGHC:15053



2026:CGHC:15053

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 2493 of 2026**

1 - Raju Gupta @ Laddu S/o Late Dwarika Prasad Gupta Aged About 29 Years R/o Village -Naviadih, P. S. -Trikunda District -Balrampur - Ramanujganj (C.G) (Note -Addresses Of The Applicant Is Wrongly Mentioned In Order Dated 06-01-2026, 11-11-2025 And 21-08-2025 And Copy Of The Statements A/1, A/2, A3 And A/4.)

... Applicant**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer Police Station -Odgi, District -Surajpur (C.G.) (Note -District Name Is Wrongly Mentioned Of The Non Applicant In Order Dated 21-08-2025)

... Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. Navneet Kumar Yadav, Adv.

For Respondent/State : Ms. Laxmeen Kashyap, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal**Order on Board****01/04/2026**

1. The accused/applicant has moved this **third** bail application under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for releasing him on regular bail during trial in connection with Crime No. 12/2025 registered at Police Station – Odgi, District – Surajpur (C.G.) for



the offence punishable under Sections 61, 70(2), 87, 137(2) and 3(5) of BNS and Sections 4 & 6 of POCSO Act.

2. The first and second bail applications of the applicant had been dismissed on merit on 21.08.2025 in MCRC No. 6117/2025 and on 06.01.2026 in MCRC No. 10104/2025, respectively.
3. As per the prosecution's case, on 15.04.2025, father of the victim lodged a written complaint stating that on 13.04.2025 the victim was going to local market and for that she was standing near the road side. At that time, the applicant along with co-accused namely Abrar Ansari stopped the car and given lift to the victim. Thereafter, they took the victim to Kudargarh fare and while returning near Baijnath Chowk the applicant and co-accused have committed forcible sexual intercourse with her, thereby the offence has been committed.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that at the time and date of the incident, the present applicant was not present at the place of the incident as he was purchasing clothes for himself along with his wife in the local market. The CCTV footage of the shop in pen drive dated 13.05.2025 at about 07:00 pm is annexed herein as Annexure A/5. The applicant is in jail since 18.04.2025, and another co-accused, namely Abrar Ansari, has already been granted bail by the learned trial Court; therefore, on the basis of parity, the applicant is also entitled to be enlarged on bail. There is no



likelihood of his case being decided in the near future; therefore, the present applicant may also be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application and submits that the co-accused has been granted bail by the trial Court because the victim has stated in her Court statement that she does not identify the co-accused, Abrar Ansari, and he has not committed any offence against her; therefore, the co-accused has been granted bail, but looking to the material available on record against the applicant, he is not entitled to enlarge on bail.
6. The victim and her father appeared through V.C. from the concerned DLSA and raised objection to grant of bail to the applicant.
7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
8. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, particularly looking to the material available on record, the evidence collected by the prosecution against the applicant and also looking to the fact that after dismissal of the second bail application of the applicant, there is no change of circumstances, therefore, at this stage, I am not inclined to release the applicant on bail.
9. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, is **rejected**.
10. However, considering the fact that the applicant is in jail since 18.04.2025, and only 6 witnesses out of 22 witnesses have been



examined till date, the concerned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and to ensure that the trial is concluded as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of 5 months from the receipt of the copy of this order.

11. Office is directed to sent a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge

H.L. Sahu