



2026:CGHC:25681

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CRA No. 1049 of 2026**

Hemant Rajput S/o Devkumar Rajput, Aged About 24 Years R/o Darri,
Police Station Dongargaon, District -Rajnandgaon C.G.

... Appellant**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station
Dongargaon- District Rajnandgaon C.G.

--- Respondent

For Appellant : Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate

For Respondent-State : Mr. Vivek Sharma, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Radhakishan Agrawal
Order on Board**23/06/2026**

1. This appeal under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Caste & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, (for short, 'Act of 1989') is filed against impugned order dated 08.04.2026 passed by learned Special Judge, under Scheduled Caste & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, Rajnandgaon (CG) in Special Case No.11/2025, whereby appellant's application filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of bail is rejected.
2. Appellant is in jail since 22.06.2025 in connection with Crime

No.202/2025 registered at Police Station – Dongargaon, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 332(b), 64(2)(m) of BNS and Section 3(2)(v) of the SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

3. As per case of prosecution, the prosecutrix lodged the written report alleging that on 21.06.2025, when the prosecutrix was alone at her home, the present appellant entered in her home and committed forcible sexual intercourse with her. Upon her raising alarm and hearing the voice of neighbors, the appellant fled from the spot. On the basis of said report, offence registered against the appellant.
4. Learned counsel for appellant submits that appellant has been falsely implicated in this case, he has not committed any offence as alleged against him. He further submits that the learned trial Court has rejected the bail application of the appellant without properly appreciating the medical contradiction and lack of medical corroboration. He also submits that the appellant is in jail since 22.06.2025, conclusion of trial may take time, hence, appellant may be released on bail.
5. Learned State Counsel opposes the submission made by learned counsel for the appellant and submits that as per statement of PW-1, the appellant has committed the aforesaid offence and some other prosecution witnesses have also been supported the case of prosecution, therefore, the appellant may not be released on bail.
6. Pursuant to order dated 23.04.2026, victim and her elder sister appeared

through virtual mode from the DLSA Rajnandgaon. On being asked, the victim has raised objection for grant of bail to the appellant.

7. I have heard learned counsel for parties.
8. Considering the facts and circumstances of case and perused the documents and further looking to the nature and gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the accused/appellant. Accordingly, the instant bail application is **rejected**.
9. 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