



2026:CGHC:20714

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRCA No. 659 of 2026**

Rameshwar S/o Sahettar Aged About 27 Years R/o Ward - 6 Village And
Post Office Rasota Tahsil- Pamgarh, District- Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

... Applicant**versus**

State of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station, Kartala, District- Korba
(C.G.)

... Non-Applicant

For Applicant	: Dr. Sudeep Agrawal, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	: Mr. S.S. Baghel, Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order On Board****04.05.2026**

1. The applicant has preferred this application under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), for grant of anticipatory bail, apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 19/2025, registered at Police Station Kartala, District- Korba, (C.G.) for alleged commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. As per the case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the Tehsildar, Kartala, submitted a written complaint before Police Station Kartala



stating that the Patwari of Halka No. 34, namely Lokeshwar Maitri, had allegedly recorded partition entries in respect of land bearing Khasra Nos. 223, 265, 312, 503 and 980, situated at Village Chorbhatti, Tehsil Kartala, in the names of 10 persons in RD series and verified the same on 24.10.2024 using his digital signature; it was alleged that such entries were made in violation of prescribed rules, thereby implicating the said Patwari, the computer operator Bittu Chauhan, and the concerned beneficiaries, namely Vijay S/o Melaram, Naveen Bahadur S/o Hari Bahadur, Gajanand S/o Heerdas Satnami, Rameshwar S/o Sahetter, Dhanesh S/o Parsaram Kumhar, Heerdas S/o Bhawandas, Bhaleshwar S/o Shiv Kumar Teli, Vinod Vishwas S/o Vivek Vishwas (Bengali), Domendra Prasad S/o Mahavir Koshta and Jyoti Rai W/o Prince Rai Thakur. Pursuant to the said complaint and on the directions received, an offence has been registered against the accused persons, including Rameshwar (present applicant) and Domendra Prasad Devangan and others, for offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023, and the matter is under investigation, hence, the present anticipatory bail application.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in a concocted and baseless story, and that the essential ingredients of the alleged offences are completely absent in the present case, rendering the registration of the FIR arbitrary and illegal. It is further submitted that the applicant was in no manner involved in any alleged illegal transfer or partition of land, and had neither visited the Patwari office



nor submitted any application for mutation or partition. Learned counsel submits that the applicant has no criminal antecedents and belongs to a respectable family. It is also contended that the applicant has not submitted any forged documents before any bank, and that one Bittu Chauhan, who was acquainted with both the Patwari and the applicant, had independently obtained a loan in the applicant's name and completed the formalities. It is further submitted that the loan amount of Rs. 10,00,000/- is being regularly repaid, and no wrongful loss has been caused. Learned counsel emphasizes that no overt act has been attributed to the applicant and there are no specific or direct allegations against him in the prosecution case. It is also submitted that the applicant's wife is pregnant and his presence is necessary for her proper care and medical attention, in support of which medical documents have been filed as Annexure A/3. Lastly, it is submitted that the applicant is ready and willing to furnish adequate surety and undertakes to abide by all terms and conditions that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court while granting anticipatory bail. Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the present applicant.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature, involving illegal manipulation of land records and fraudulent acts committed in connivance with co-accused persons, which require thorough investigation. It is further submitted that the applicant cannot escape liability merely by denying involvement, as his name figures



in the transactions and the benefit of such illegal acts has accrued to him. He contends that the investigation is at a crucial stage and custodial interrogation of the applicant may be necessary to unearth the larger conspiracy. It is also submitted that similarly placed co-accused, namely Domendra Prasad Dewangan, has already been rejected anticipatory bail by this Hon'ble Court in MCRCA No. 632/2026 vide order dated 30.04.2026, and therefore, the present applicant is not entitled to anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is prayed that the anticipatory bail application of the applicant deserves to be rejected.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the allegations, and the material available on record, this Court finds that the accusations pertain to illegal manipulation of land records and wrongful entries made in respect of several Khasra numbers in violation of prescribed rules, which prima facie disclose a well-planned act carried out in connivance with other co-accused persons. The applicant's name figures among the beneficiaries of such alleged illegal entries, and at this stage, his contention of non-involvement cannot be accepted without a thorough investigation. The investigation appears to be at a crucial stage and the possibility of a larger conspiracy involving multiple persons, including public officials, cannot be ruled out, thereby necessitating custodial interrogation of the applicant. Further, it is significant to note that a similarly placed co-accused, namely



Domendra Prasad Dewangan, has already been rejected the benefit of anticipatory bail by this Court in MCRCA No. 632/2026 vide order dated 30.04.2026, and no distinguishing circumstances have been shown by the present applicant so as to take a different view. In view of the seriousness of the allegations, the nature of offence, the requirement of effective investigation, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the applicant - **Rameshwar**, involved in Crime No. 19/2025, registered at Police Station Kartala, District- Korba, (C.G.) for alleged commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, is **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Rahul Dewangan