



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 753 of 2026

Abhishekh Sharma S/o Chandraprakash Sharma Aged About 23 Years R/o Ward No. 10, Sahaspur Lohara, Police Station Sahaspur Lohara, District- Kabirdham (C.G.)

... Appellant

versus

The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Sahaspur Lohara, District- Kabirdham (C.G.)

... Respondent

(Cause title is taken from CIS)

For Appellant	:	Mr. Amit Kumar Sahu, Adv.
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. KK Bahrani, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal

Order On Board

01/04/2026

1. The victim appeared virtually before this Court today and recorded objection in granting bail to the Appellant.
2. This appeal has been filed under Section 14-A (2) of the SCST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 for grant of regular bail to the appellant as he is arrested in connection with crime number 248/2025, registered at police station Sahaspur Lohara, District

Kabirdham (C.G.) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 296, 351 (3), 109(1) alternate offence Section 109(1)/3 (5) of BNS, Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) & 3 (2)(v-a) and 3(2)(v) of SCST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

3. In this case, there are 4 accused persons. The prosecution case is that on 24.10.2025, an accident occurred between co-accused Nitin @ Nitesh Vaishnav and Vivek Joshi. Following this, the appellant Abhishek Sharma, along with co-accused Harish Vaishnav and Minesh, allegedly grabbed Dilip Joshi (Vivek's father). Nitin allegedly abused Dilip Joshi with filthy language, threatened to kill him, and assaulted him with a knife, causing injuries. Based on this, an offence was registered against the appellant and co-accused, and the appellant was arrested on 25.10.2025.
4. By order dated 26.02.2026 passed by learned Special Judge (Prevention of atrocities Act), Kabirdham, District Kawardha in Special Criminal Case No.570/2025, the bail application filed by the appellant has been rejected. Hence, this appeal.
5. Learned Counsel appearing for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. No seizure has been made from the applicant. The only allegation against the applicant is that he was present on spot on the date of incident. He further submits that there is nothing to suggest that the offence was committed by the appellant only on the ground that the victim/injured belongs to Schedule Caste. The appellant is in jail since 25.10.2025, there are total 29 prosecution witnesses, the trial has not commenced till date and is likely to take some time to be finalized, therefore, it is prayed that the appeal may be allowed and the appellant may be released on bail.
6. On the other hand, learned Counsel appearing for the State opposes the bail application and submits that there is sufficient

evidence available on record against the appellant, he grabbed the victim/injured at the time of incident. The appellant has two previous criminal records. Hence, looking to the nature of offence, the appellant may not be granted bail.

7. I have heard learned Counsel appearing for the parties and perused the documents available on record.
8. Considering the circumstances of the case, evidence collected by the prosecution against the appellant. Further considering the fact that the trial has not commenced, without commenting on merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that it would not be appropriate to release the appellant on bail.
9. Accordingly, the appeal is **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge