



2026:CGHC:21483

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 3419 of 2026**

Singhrai Kumeti S/o Fagu Ram Kumeti Aged About 35 Years Caste -
Gond R/o Dakpara, Maahka, Narayanpur P.S. And District- Narayanpur
(C.G.)

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

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Station House Officer, P.S. Gandhinagar,
District- Surguja (C.G.)

... Non-applicant(s)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Nishi Kant Sinha, Advocate.
For Non-Applicant	:	Mr. Shailendra Sharma, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****07/05/2026**

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the BNSS for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 59/2026 registered at Police Station Gandhinagar, District- Surguja (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 332(B), 64(2)(m) of B.N.S.
2. As per the prosecution story, the victim lodged a written report stating that she came into contact with the applicant in the year 2023 through phone calls and thereafter they developed a love relationship. In April, 2024, the applicant proposed marriage to her

and since the applicant was serving in the BSF, she accepted the proposal. Thereafter, the applicant came to her room and stayed there, during which they developed physical relations. Subsequently, the applicant used to visit her every six months and establish physical relations with her. Thereafter, during the period from 15.12.2025 to 28.12.2025, the applicant again committed the same act. On 28.12.2025, they went to Mahamaya Temple and got married and on 09.01.2026 they also executed a notarized affidavit of marriage. Thereafter, the applicant went away and when the victim went to the house of the applicant to reside there as his wife, she was denied entry on the ground that the applicant was already married and had children. Thereafter, she lodged the present report.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the present applicant has not committed any of the offences alleged against him and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the victim is a major and adult lady who remained in a relationship with the applicant from the year 2023 to 2026 and, during the said period, they developed consensual physical relations on several occasions at the victim's place. It is also submitted that the victim was well aware that the applicant was a married man having children, yet she voluntarily developed an extra-marital relationship with him only because the applicant was serving in the BSF and she believed that her future would remain secure. Learned counsel further submits that the alleged relationship between the victim and the applicant was purely consensual in nature between two adults, without any coercion, inducement or threat and only when the

applicant refused to fulfil the illegal demands of the victim, she lodged the present false report against him. It is further submitted that the applicant is in custody since 10.02.2026, the charge-sheet has already been filed and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Therefore, no further custodial interrogation of the applicant is required. It is also submitted that the applicant is serving in the BSF and prolonged incarceration would seriously prejudice his future prospects. Hence, it is prayed that the applicant be enlarged on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel appearing for the respondent/State has vehemently opposed the bail application and submits that from perusal of the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, it clearly transpires that the applicant established physical relations with the victim on the false pretext of marriage despite knowing fully well that he was already a married man having children. It is further submitted that the applicant intentionally concealed his marital status from the victim and induced her to enter into a physical relationship by assuring her of marriage. He further submits that the victim has specifically stated that the applicant solemnized marriage with her at Mahamaya Temple and also executed a notarized affidavit of marriage in order to gain her confidence and continue the physical relationship. However, when the victim went to the house of the applicant to reside there as his wife, she was denied entry and only thereafter she came to know that the applicant was already married. It is further submitted that the conduct of the applicant clearly

reflects dishonest intention from the very inception and, therefore, no case for grant of bail is made out. Hence, he prays for rejection of the bail application.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the allegations levelled against the applicant, the period of detention of the applicant since 10.02.2026, and further considering the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, this Court finds that the victim is a major and adult lady and admittedly she remained in a relationship with the applicant from the year 2023 onwards. During the said period, both of them remained in a love affair and established physical relations on several occasions. The material available on record further reflects that the victim was aware of the marital status of the applicant and the dispute appears to have arisen subsequently when their relationship could not be materialized into a matrimonial relationship. Further, the applicant and the victim had allegedly solemnized marriage at Mahamaya Temple and also executed a notarized affidavit of marriage. The applicant is in custody since 10.02.2026, charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court and conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. Therefore, without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant is entitled to be enlarged on bail.
7. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant is **allowed**.

8. Let the Applicant- **Singhrai Kumeti**, involved in Crime No. 59/2026 registered at Police Station Gandhinagar, District- Surguja (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 332(B), 64(2)(m) of B.N.S, be released on bail on his furnishing a **personal bond** with **two sureties** in the like sum to the satisfaction of the Court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the trial court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.

(ii) The applicant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the trial court may proceed against him under Section 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(iii) In case, the applicant misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure his presence, proclamation under Section 84 of BNSS. is issued and the applicant fails to appear before the court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against him, in accordance with law, under Section 209 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(iv) The applicant shall remain present, in person, before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case,

(ii) framing of charge and (iii) recording of statement under Section 351 of BNSS. If in the opinion of the trial court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the trial court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

9. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information.

**Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice**

Kunal