



2026:CGHC:18445



2026:CGHC:18445

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****CRA No. 861 of 2026**

- Darmendra Sonkar S/o Shyam Lal Sonkar Aged About 26 Years R/o Shyam Nagar Camp 02, Bhilai Tehsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.

...Appellant**versus**

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through (Police Station Purani Bhilai), Durg, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent

For Appellant	:	Mr. Waquar Naiyer, Advocate.
For Respondent	:	Mr. Vivek Sharma, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Radhakishan Agrawal**Order on Board****22/04/2026**

- This appeal has been filed by the accused/appellant under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 read with Section 483 of the BNSS, seeking grant of bail, against the order dated 11.02.2026 passed by the learned Special Judge, SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, Durg (C.G.), in Special Case (SC/ST) No. 460/2026, whereby the bail application filed by the appellant under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 has been rejected.
- The appellant was arrested in connection with Crime No. 84/2026 (wrongly mentioned as 79/2026 in the bail rejection order), registered at



Police Station Purani Bhilai, District Durg, C.G., for the offences punishable under Sections 79 and 296 of the BNS, 2023 and Section 3(1)(w)(ii) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, "the Act of 1989").

3. As per the prosecution case, the complainant, who works at Sai Naman Hospital, has alleged that the accused, Dharmendra Sonkar, used to harass her by passing obscene remarks, abusing her, and making vulgar gestures while she was commuting to her workplace. On 04.02.2026, the accused allegedly made further obscene comments and gestures, including offering money and attempting to outrage her modesty. On the report being lodged to the above effect, the aforesaid offences have been registered against the present appellant.
4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is an innocent person and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the allegations against the appellant are false and fabricated, and prima facie no evidence is available against him. It is also submitted that the appellant has been in custody since 06.02.2026 and that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time. Therefore, it is prayed that the appellant be released on bail.
5. Learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application.
6. Prosecutrix appeared through DLSA, Durg and raised objections to the release of the applicant on bail.
7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of allegation leveled against the appellant, the detention period of the appellant, further considering that the appellant has no criminal antecedents, the charge-sheet has already been filed, and that the



conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the present is a fit case for grant of bail to the appellant. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

9. It is directed that, in the event of the appellant executing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, he shall be released on bail on the following conditions:-

- (i) he 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 him from disclosing such fact to the Court,
- (ii) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, and
- (iii) he shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.
- (iv) he shall not involve himself in any offence of similar nature in future.

Sd/-

(Radhakishan Agrawal)
Judge