



2026:CGHC:17813



2026:CGHC:17813

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRMP No. 1100 of 2026

Devkumar Yadav S/o Awadesh Yadav Aged About 27 Years R/o Ward No. 7,
Nagar Panchayat Saja, Police Station Saja, District Bemetara, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Chouki
Devkar, Police Station Saja, District Bemetara, Chhattisgarh

2 - XYZ

... Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Amit Kumar Sahu, Advocate with the petitioner Devkumar Yadav.
For Respondent 1/State	: Shri Vivek Sharma, Panel Lawyer.
For Respondent 2	: Shri K.P.S. Gandhi, Advocate with the Victim.

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RADHAKISHAN AGRAWAL)

Order on Board

20/04/2026

- In this petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, the petitioner sought for setting aside the impugned order dated 24.03.2026 passed in Sessions Case No. 48/2025 by the 1st Additional Sessions Judge (FTC), Bemetara whereby the learned Judge cancelled the bail granted to the petitioner on 18.07.2025.
- Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner had forcibly established the physical relations with the victim on the false pretext of marriage and thereafter on several times established the physical relations with



the victim. Based on which, the victim / respondent No.2 made a complaint on 04.06.2025 before the Police Station, Outpost Devkar, District Bemetara (C.G.) where offence under Sections 69, 64(2)(m), 296, 351(2) & 115(2) under Crime No. 136/2025 has been registered against the petitioner and the petitioner was arrested. The learned trial Court granted bail to the petitioner on 18.07.2025 imposing certain conditions. It has been alleged by the complainant that the petitioner herein is misusing the bail granted to him by the learned Court. It has also been alleged that the petitioner was trying to harass the complainant, who was compelled to file a written complaint before the concerned Police Station as well as before the learned trial Court for cancellation of bail and the learned trial Court, after hearing the parties, cancelled the bail. Hence, this petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was granted bail on 18.07.2025 and thereafter, trial was going on and on an application filed by the victim on 04.02.2026, the trial Court, vide order dated 24.03.2026, cancelled the bail granted earlier on 18.07.2025. The accused/petitioner has not misused the liberty granted by the Court. He submits that the petitioner and victim have performed marriage on 12.04.2026 and victim is now residing with the accused/husband in her matrimonial house and by way of covering memo dated 20.04.2026, he has brought copies of documents showing the marriage between the petitioner and the victim.
4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that the trial Court was justified in cancelling the bail granted to the petitioner on 18.07.2025.
5. Learned counsel for respondent No.2/victim submits that the victim had



performed marriage with the petitioner on 12.04.2026 and respondent No.2 is living happily with the petitioner in her matrimonial house along with the petitioner and his parents and that there is no complaint at all between the petitioner and the victim. He further submits that the application dated 04.02.2026 was not filed by the family members of the victim.

6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing for the parties and perused the documents annexed with the petition.
7. Upon perusal of the record, it is evident that the accused/petitioner was granted bail vide order dated 18.07.2025 and thereafter it was cancelled vide impugned order dated 24.03.2026 and that during course of proceedings pending before the learned Court, both the petitioner and the victim had performed marriage and after marriage both the parties are living in the house of the petitioner and that presently there is no complaint at all between them.
8. In the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly, considering the fact that as per victim's version, her family members have filed the complaint, I am inclined to allow the petition.
9. Accordingly, the CrMP is allowed and the impugned order dated 24.03.2026 cancelling the bail is hereby set aside and the order dated 18.07.2025 granting bail to the petitioner shall remain effective.
10. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith

Sd/-

(Radhakishan Agrawal)

JUDGE