



2026:CGHC:18627

1



2026:CGHC:18627

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**CRA No. 977 of 2026**

**1** - Lalan Gupta S/o Shri Manohan Gupta Aged About 57 Years (Somewere Mention Lallan) R/o Village Saagobandh P/S Babhni District - Sonbhadra U.P.

**2** - Ramvachan @ Mukhlal Gupta S/o Shri Manmohan Gupta Aged About 61 Years (Only Mukhlal Mention In Order) R/o Village Saagobandh P/s Babhni District - Sonbhadra U.P.

**--- Appellant(s)**

**versus**

**1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through P/s Sanaval District - Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.)

**--- Respondent(s)**

**CRA No. 943 of 2026**

**1** - Satan Dev Gupta S/o Ramnath Gupta Aged About 50 Years R/o Village- Sagobandh, P.S. Babhni, District Sonbhadra (U.P.)

**---Appellant(s)**

**Versus**

**1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer- Police Station- Sanawal, District- Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.)

**--- Respondent(s)**

**CRA No. 967 of 2026**

**1** - Nandlal Gupta S/o Late Ghurasaw Aged About 53 Years R/o Village Sagobandh, P.S. Babhni, Distt. Sonbhadra, U.P.



---Appellant(s)

**Versus**

1 - The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer P.S.  
Sanawal, Distt. Balrampur Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)

**CRA No. 855 of 2026**

1 - Manoj Kumar Gupta S/o Mukhlal Aged About 34 Years R/o Village-  
Talkeshwarpur, P.S.- Sanawal, District- Balrampur- Ramanujganj  
Chhattisgarh

---Appellant(s)

**Versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, P.S.  
Sanawal, District- Balrampur- Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent(s)

**CRA No. 919 of 2026**

1 - Ram Lakhan Gupta S/o Manmohan Gupta Aged About 65 Years R/o  
Village Talkeshwarpur, P.S. Sanawal, District- Balrampur- Ramanujganj  
Chhattisgarh (Appellant Address Wrongly Mentioned In The Impugned  
Order)

---Appellant(s)

**Versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, P.S.  
Sanawal, District- Balrampur- Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent(s)

**CRA No. 924 of 2026**

1 - Arvind Gupta S/o Lalan Gupta Aged About 40 Years R/o Village-  
Sago Bandh, P.S.- Babhni, District- Sonbhadra (Up)

---Appellant(s)

**Versus**



1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, P.S.  
Sanawal, District- Balrampur- Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent(s)

**CRA No. 890 of 2026**

1 - Vikas Nand S/o Lallan Aged About 28 Years R/o Village -  
Talkeshwarpur, P.S. Sanawal, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj  
Chhattisgarh

---Appellant(s)

**Versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, P.S.  
Sanawal, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent(s)

**CRA No. 944 of 2026**

1 - Vinod Gupta S/o Shri Balkeshwar Gupta Aged About 30 Years R/o  
Village Saagobandh P/s Babhni Distt. Sonbhadra Up., Chhattisgarh

---Appellant(s)

**Versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through P/s Sanawar Distt. Balrampur  
Ramanujganj CG

--- Respondent(s)

**CRA No. 981 of 2026**

1 - Ashok Kumar Gupta S/o Shri Ramnath Gupta Aged About 40 Years  
R/o- Village Saagobandh, P/s Babhni Distt. Sonbhadra U.P.

---Appellant(s)

**Versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through P/s Sanawal Distt. Balrampur-  
Ramanujganj C.G.

--- Respondent(s)



---

For Appellants : Mr. Ajay Kumar Mishra, Mr. Rishikant Mahobia & Mr. Navneet Kumar Yadav, Advocates

For Respondent/State : Mr. Anish Tiwari, Dy. Govt. Advocate

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal**

**Order On Board**

**23/04/2026**

1. On 15.04.2026, the victim appeared before this Court through virtual mode from the concerned DLSA and raised objection in the matter.
2. All the nine appeals under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (in short "the SC/ST Act") have been preferred against the orders dated 16.02.2026, 09.03.2026, 12.03.2026 & 18.03.2026 passed by the Special Judge (SC/ST Prevention of Atrocities Act), Balrampur, Place Ramanujganj, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.) whereby the second bail applications filed by the appellants under Section 483 of BNSS in connection with Crime No.46/2025 registered at Police Station Sanawal, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 296, 351(2), 115(2), 109(1) of BNS and Sections 3(1)(R)(S)(G) & 3 (2-5) of the SC/ST Act have been rejected.
3. As per the prosecution case, the complainant, Ramsai, lodged a report stating that on 11.08.2025, around 9:00 AM, while he was cultivating his field, the appellants, along with other co-accused, arrived there armed with sticks, clubs, and axe. They stopped him from working, hurled filthy abuses and caste-based slurs, and assaulted him, claiming the field belonged to them and



threatening to kill him. When other injured persons intervened, the accused attacked them as well. Based on this report, an FIR was registered against the appellants and co-accused for the alleged offences, and the appellants were subsequently arrested.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the appellants submit that the appellants are innocent and they have been falsely implicated due to land dispute. They submit that the appellants Lallan Gupta, Ramlakhan Gupta, Satan Dev Gupta, Vinod Gupta, Nandlal Gupta and Ashok Gupta are specifically named in the FIR, whereas the other appellants have not been named. Wooden sticks were seized from Arvind and Manoj. They submit that the dispute arose over a land-related matter and Patwari Jivan Kerketta (P.W.-4) has stated in his court statement that none of the victims possess any land in the vicinity of the incident site and it was the victims party who arrived to take illegal possession, which caused the dispute. They further submit that the prosecution mentions the use of a 'Tangi' (axe) but no such weapon has been seized from any of the present appellants. The 'Tangi' was seized from co-accused Rampyare but the allegation of assaulting with it were made against Rampyare Gupta, Harinarayan and Dayashankar. It is also submitted that co-accused Rampyare, Harinarayan and Dayashankar have already been granted bail and the case of the present appellants is not more severe than theirs. Therefore, based on the principle of parity, the appellants should be released on bail. They further submit that all the appellants have been in custody since August 2025, out of a total of 28 witnesses, only 6 have been examined so far and the trial is likely to take considerable time for its completion. Therefore, considering all these facts the appeals may be allowed and the appellants be released on bail.
5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the said prayer and submits that the injured/victim



Vidyasagar, who sustained grievous injuries, has named all ten appellants in his statement recorded under Section 161 CrPC, however, he has not yet been examined before the trial Court. Therefore, considering the nature of offence, the appellants do not deserve to be released on bail.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
7. In this matter, charge sheet has been filed against a total of 22 persons. The anticipatory bail of two accused persons has already been granted by this Bench. There are a total of 19 persons named in the FIR. As of today, the prosecution has not been able to examine the injured persons - Vidyasagar, Vijay Singh and Shankar while only one injured Tilak has been examined. Out of 28 witnesses, only 06 have been examined so far. Although injured Vidyasagar is stated to have sustained grievous injuries, he has not yet been examined. Furthermore, co-accused Rampyare, Harinarayan, and Dayashankar who were named in the FIR and specifically accused of using a 'Tangi' (axe) have already been granted bail.
8. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the statement of Patwari Jivan Kerketta (P.W.- 4), the custody period of the appellants since August, 2025 and noting that the final conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time, without commenting anything on merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that a case for grant of bail to the appellants has been made out.
9. Accordingly, all the nine appeals are **allowed**. The impugned orders are set aside. It is directed that the appellants shall be released on bail on their furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety each in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court. The appellants are directed to appear before the trial Court on each and every date



2026:CGHC:18627

7

to be given to them by the said Court till completion of the trial.

10. Let a certified copy of this order be sent to the trial Court concerned for necessary information.

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

Khatai