



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 2632 of 2026

Sameer Khare S/o Prakash Khare, Aged About 20 Years R/o- Ward No. 09
Pipariya, P.S.- Pipariya, Distt- Kabirdham (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- S.H.O., Police Station - Pipariya, Distt-
Kabirdham (C.G.)

... Respondent

(Cause title is taken from CIS)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Akhtar Hussain, Adv.
For Respondent/State	:	Ms. Vithika Choubey, P.L.

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

1. The victim and her mother appeared virtually and recorded 'objection' in granting bail the applicant.
2. The applicant has preferred this 1st bail application under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita Act 2023 for grant of regular bail as he is arrested in connection with crime No. 51/2025, registered at Police Station – Pipariya, District- Kabirdham (C.G.) for offence punishable under Sections 137(2), 87, 64(2)(M), 65(1) of BNS, Section 376 (क)(ख) of IPC and Section 4(2) and 6 of the POCSO Act, 2012.
3. As per prosecution story, the incident had taken place in between 03.03.2025 to 05.03.2025. On 03.03.2025, the applicant induced the minor victim who was aged about 14-15 years at the time of incident and taken her with him to Bilaspur thereafter to Bangalore and

committed sexual intercourse with her on several occasions. Based on above, offence has been registered against the applicant and he was arrested on 22.06.2025.

4. 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 victim was a consenting party. They had a love affair. The victim was joined the company of the applicant on her own free will. They both have performed marriage with each other and were living as husband wife in Bangalore. The applicant is in jail since 22.06.2025, out of 26 prosecution witnesses, 10 have been examined till date and the trial is likely to take time to be finalized, therefore, it is prayed that the applicant may be enlarged on bail.
5. Per contra, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the bail application and submits that at the time of incident, the victim was minor aged about 14-15 years, therefore, looking to the nature of offence, the applicant may not be released on bail.
6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing for the parties and perused the material available on record.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, evidence collected by the prosecution against the applicant and the age of victim at the time of incident, without commenting on merits of the case, I am not inclined to release the applicant on bail.
8. Accordingly, the bail application is **rejected**.
9. However, looking to the detention period of the applicant, the concerned Trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial and to ensure that the trial is concluded as early as possible preferably within a period of 5 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge