



2026:CGHC:12970



2026:CGHC:12970

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRCA No. 418 of 2026**

1 - Surendra Verma S/o Venkateshwar Verma Aged About 29 Years R/o
Graam- Raaikheda Thana Kharora Dist- Raipur (C.G.)

2 - Hemant Verma S/o Venkateshwar Verma Aged About 35 Years R/o
Graam- Raaikheda Thana- Kharora Dist- Raipur (C.G.)

3 - Bhojram Dheewar S/o Umendra Dheewar Aged About 30 Years R/o
Gramm- Raaikheda Thana- Kharora Dist- Raipur (C.G.)

4 - Udit Naraayan S/o Bisahu Ram Dheewar Aged About 28 Years R/o
Graam- Raaikheda Thana- Kharora Dist- Raipur (C.G.) (Wrongly
Mentioned As Ujeet Narayan In F.I.R.)

5 - Mukesh Verma S/o Dhannalal Verma Aged About 38 Years R/o
Graam- Raaikheda Thana- Kharora Dist- Raipur (C.G.) (Wrongly
Mentioned As Maneesh Verma In F.I.R.)

... Applicant(s)**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer (S.H.O.) Police
Station - Kharora Dist- Raipur (C.G.)

---- Non-applicant(s)

For Applicants

:Mr. Shalvin Sharma, Advocate.

For Non-applicant/State

:Mr. Sourabh Sahu, Panel Lawyer.

**Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice****Order on Board****18.03.2026**

1. This first anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sahinta, 2023 has been filed by the applicant, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 73/2026 registered at Police Station – Kharora, District-Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 191(3), 332(b), 296, 351(2), 115(2), 324(5), 309(4), 309(6) of B.N.S.
2. The prosecution's case, in brief, is that the complainant, Pappu Purena Satnami, submitted a written report at Police Station Kharora stating that he is a resident of Village and Post Beldarsivni, Police Station and Tehsil Kharora, District Raipur (C.G.), and operates a family restaurant named “Mohini Mogra” at Village Chicholi, Police Station and Tehsil Kharora, District Raipur. On 23.01.2026, on the occasion of Basant Panchami, a fair (Madai Mela) and a night cultural program were organized at Village Raikheda. On the same night, between approximately 2:00 a.m. and 2:30 a.m., the Sarpanch of Gram Panchayat Raikheda, Dinesh Verma, along with his brother Surendra Verma, Hemant Verma, Deputy Sarpanch Bhojram Dheewar, Ujit Narayan, Manish Verma, and about 25–30 other associates, allegedly came to his family restaurant at Chicholi. They abused the manager Kamleshwar Bandhe and Tarun Ghritlahare in filthy language, forcibly opened the door and entered the premises. It is alleged that they took Rs. 24,000/- in cash from the cash counter (galla) along with two mobile



phones (Vivo and Oppo) and kept them in their jeans pockets. Their associates allegedly vandalized the shop. When Tarun Ghrilahare objected and stated that he would inform the owner, Deputy Sarpanch Bhojram Dheewar allegedly caught his collar and assaulted him. It is further alleged that the CCTV camera system, including the DVD cable and television installed near the cash counter in the store room, was broken by Sarpanch Dinesh Verma and his brother Hemant Verma using sticks and iron rods. Tarun Ghrilahare and Kamleshwar Bandhe allegedly fled from the back door to save themselves. The accused persons allegedly damaged all articles in the restaurant and six motorcycles belonging to the workers using rods and crowbars, causing extensive damage. The prosecution story further states that at about 3:25 a.m., Tarun Ghrilahare informed the complainant about the incident through Devendra Yadav (mechanic). The complainant immediately went to Police Station Kharora at about 3:30 a.m. and informed the Station House Officer, who allegedly advised him not to return to the restaurant that night as the Sarpanch and others had just left and police personnel had been deployed there. At about 4:00 a.m., Devendra Yadav, Tarun Ghrilahare, and Kamleshwar Bandhe allegedly saw the accused again vandalizing the restaurant in the presence of police personnel, causing damage amounting to approximately Rs. 6,50,000/- (Rupees Six Lakhs Fifty Thousand). On the basis of the said report of the complainant, Pappu Purena Satnami, lodged a report for offences punishable under the relevant provisions of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS).



3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case on vague and baseless allegations arising out of political rivalry. It is contended that the FIR has been lodged after an unexplained delay of about 10 days and the names of the applicants have been subsequently introduced, despite the fact that the CCTV footage, which is the primary piece of evidence, does not demonstrate their presence at the alleged place of occurrence, and no injury report (MLC) has been produced. It is further submitted that the main accused, Dinesh Verma, has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in MCRCA No. 339/2026 vide order dated 02.03.2026 and the complainant himself has filed a no objection affidavit stating that the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties. It is also argued that the applicants have no criminal antecedents therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicants on the ground of parity.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the allegations against the applicants are serious in nature, involving offences of theft, assault and vandalism causing substantial loss. It is contended that considering the gravity of the offence and the manner in which the incident has been committed along with other co-accused persons, the applicants are not entitled to the benefit of



anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is prayed that the application be rejected.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the facts & circumstances of the case, submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and nature of dispute and material available in case diary and further the fact that similarly situated co-accused, who is the main accused namely, Dinesh Verma, has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in MCRCA No. 339/2026, vide order dated 02.03.2026 and the case of the applicants are better than the case of co-accused, as such, without further commenting anything on merits, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicants on the basis of parity.
7. Accordingly, the instant MCRCA is **allowed** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicants- **Surendra Verma, Hemant Verma, Bhojram Dheewar, Udit Naraayan** and **Mukesh Verma**, on executing a personal bond and one surety each in the like sum to the satisfaction of the arresting Officer, they shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-
 - (a) They shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such fact to the Court.
 - (b) They shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.



2026:CGHC:12970

(c) They shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

(d) the applicants and the surety shall submit a copy of their adhaar card along with a coloured postcard full size photo having printed the adhaar number on it, which shall be verified by the trial Court.

(e) They shall not involve themselves in any offence of similar nature in future.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Kunal