



NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****CRA No. 824 of 2026**

Roshan Gupta S/o Shri Shivkumar Gupta Aged About 20 Years R/o  
Village- Jamgala Mahuvatikra, P.S.- Lakhanpur, Distt.- Surguja (C.G.)

**... Appellant****versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- P.S.- Ambikapur, District- Surguja (C.G.)

**... Respondent**

---

For Appellant	:	Mr. Bhupendra Singh, Advocate, with Ms. Soniya Kuldeep, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Afroz Khan, P.L.

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal****Order On Board****17.04.2026**

1. On 08.04.2026, the victim along with her father appeared through VC from the concerned DLSA and objected to grant bail to the appellant.
2. This appeal under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (in short "the SC/ST Act") has been preferred by the appellant against the order dated 03.03.2026 passed by the Special Judge (Atrocities), Surguja, Ambikapur (C.G.) whereby the bail application under Section 483 of BNSS filed by the appellant in respect of Crime No.899/2025 registered at Police Station



Ambikapur, District- Surguja (CG) for the offence punishable under Sections 69, 88 of BNS and Section 3 (2)(v) of the SC/ST Act has been rejected.

3. As per the prosecution case, the appellant knew that the victim was a member of Scheduled Tribe, yet he assured her of marriage, had sexual intercourse with her, and when the victim became pregnant, caused her abortion by administering abortion medicine. Subsequently, a report report being lodged in this regard, the appellant was arrested on 11.02.2026. The bail application filed by the appellant was rejected by the trial Court vide impugned order dated 03.03.2026 leading to the filing of this appeal for grant of bail.
4. Learned Counsel appearing for the appellant submit that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. They submit that there was friendship between the appellant and the victim and when the appellant refused for economic help, the victim has lodged a false report against the appellant. They submit that no offence has been committed by the appellant only on the ground that the complainant belongs to Scheduled Tribe. They further submit that the appellant is in jail since 11.02.2026 and there is no likelihood of the trial to be concluded at the earliest as it has not yet commenced. Therefore, considering all these facts, the appellant may be released on bail.
5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the said prayer and submits that the victim has supported the case of prosecution in her 183 CrPC statement and considering the nature of offence, the appellant is not eligible for grant of bail. Hence, the appeal should be dismissed.
6. Heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
7. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of



2026:CGHC:17693

the case, particularly the nature and gravity of offence and the material collected and available on record against the appellant and also considering the fact that the trial has not commenced, this Court does not find any error or illegality in the impugned order passed by the trial Court.

8. Accordingly, the present appeal stands **dismissed**.
9. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information.

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

Khatai