



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 2650 of 2026

1 - Sahdev Ratre S/o Shambhu Ram Ratre, Aged About 30 Years R/o Village Rampur, Police Station Bhakhara, District. Dhamtari.

2 - Devendra Kumar Baghel S/o Pawan Kumar Baghel Aged About 22 Years R/o Village Rampur, Police Station Bhakhara, District Dhamtari (C.G.)

... Applicants

versus

State of Chhattisgarh *through* the Station House Officer, Police of Police Station Arjuni, District Dhamtari (C.G.)

... Respondent

For the applicants	: Mr. Anil Kumar Gulati, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Anish Tiwari, Dy.Government Advocate

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)

Order on Board

30.03.2026

1. This is second bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant in Crime No.126/2025 registered at Police Station Arjuni, District Dhamtari (CG) for the offences under Sections 103(1), 309(6), 310(3), 331(8), 238, 49, 61 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Sections 25 & 27 of the Arms Act.

2. The first bail application was dismissed as withdrawn on 19.01.2026 with liberty to renew the prayer afresh.

3. As per the prosecution case on 01.09.2025 in the night at 2 O' clock, five accused namely Dhan Raj, Hem Sagar, Upendra, Chetan Sahu and Kuleshwar Sahu entered the house of complainant to commit robbery and when the said act was resisted by the complainants' husband Krit Ram Sahu, three accused have brutally assaulted him, due to which, Krit Ram died on the spot. Subsequently the FIR was lodged by the wife of deceased. During investigation, it was found that the main accused Som Prakash has plotted to commit the offence. The allegation against the present applicants is that the movements of these two persons were captured in CC camera footage at the outside the house for carrying information to the other accused who entered into the house.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that these two applicants were not involved in the offence of murder or robbery. The allegation against these two applicants is that they were waiting outside the house for other accused who entered the house for committing robbery. Except this, there is no incriminating evidence available to connect the present applicants in crime in question. He further submits that neither any of the stolen articles nor the weapon of offence was seized from the applicants. The applicants are in jail since 04.09.2025; till date out of a total 20 witnesses, only 6 have been examined and there is no immediate possibility of disposal of case, therefore, these applicants may be enlarged on bail.

5. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposes the bail application and submits that there are total 8 accused in this case; as per the Panchnama of CCTV footage, the movements of these two applicants were captured in CCTV as they were waiting outside the house for the other accomplice who committed the offence, therefore, these applicants have also played vital role in assisting the other main accused in commission of crime. He further submits that mobile phone was seized from these applicants.

6. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and the fact fact neither any stolen article nor any weapon of offence was seized from these applicants and further looking to the nature of allegation levelled against them and the trial is likely to take time, without observing anything on the merits of the case I am inclined to release the applicants on regular bail.

7. Accordingly, this bail application is allowed and the applicants are directed to be released on bail on each of them furnishing a personal bond in sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the trial Court for their appearance before the said Court on each and every date as may be directed in that behalf.

Cc as per rules.

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

Rao