



2026:CGHC:21198



2026:CGHC:21198

NAFR

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

### MCRCA No. 675 of 2026

Ram Kumar Sahu S/o- Late Khedu Ram Sahu, Aged About 50 Years  
R/o- Purani Basti, Rawanbhata Ward, Word No. 14, Beergaon, Police  
Station- Khamtarai, Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

**... Applicant**

**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police  
Station- Khamtarai, District- Raipur (C.G.)

**...Non-applicant**

---

For Applicant : Mr. Trivikram Nayak, Advocate

For Non-applicant/ State : Mr. Shailendra Sharma, P.L.

---

**Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**

### **Order on Board**

**06/05/2026**

1. This first anticipatory bail application under Section 482 of the  
Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed by the  
applicant, who is apprehending her arrest in connection with  
Crime No.179/2026 registered at Police Station – Khamtarai,



District: Raipur, C.G. for the offence punishable under Sections 61(2), 318(4), 336(3), 340(2) & 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita.

2. That the prosecution story, in brief, is that the complainant, Smt. Binda Bai, lodged a written report at Police Station Khamtarai, District Raipur (C.G.), alleging that she is the owner of land bearing Survey No. 136/17 situated at Village Rawanbhata, Tehsil Dharsiva, District Raipur, which was sold through a registered sale deed dated 15.10.2025 in favour of Vickky Puri Goswami and Ravindra Singh Arora. It is alleged that the present applicant along with other co-accused persons prepared a forged agreement to sell dated 11.07.2025 by fabricating the signature/thumb impression of the complainant and falsely showing payment of Rs. 6,11,000/-. It is further alleged that the said forged document was used for instituting a false civil suit. On the basis of the complaint and after inquiry, Crime No. 179/2026 was registered against the applicant and other accused persons at Police Station Khamtarai, District Raipur (C.G.), and investigation was taken up.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and the dispute in question is purely civil in nature arising out of an agreement to



sell, for which a civil suit is already pending before the competent Court. It is further submitted that the applicant was merely a witness to the alleged agreement and had no role in preparation of any forged document or commission of the alleged offence. Counsel submits that no *prima facie* material is available against the applicant and the case is based on documentary evidence, therefore, there is no possibility of tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses. It is also submitted that similarly situated co-accused persons have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Hon'ble Court on **27.04.2026** and, on the ground of parity, the applicant is entitled to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that the applicant has been rightly implicated on the basis of material collected during investigation. It is further submitted that serious allegations of forgery, cheating and fabrication of documents have been made against the applicant along with other co-accused persons. The State further submits that the investigation is still in progress and charge-sheet has not yet been filed, therefore custodial interrogation of the applicant may be required for proper investigation of the case. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence, it is submitted



that the applicant is not entitled to grant of anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials available on record.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that the investigation is still in progress and charge-sheet has not yet been filed, coupled with the fact that the applicant has no previous criminal antecedents, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the applicant does not appear necessary at this stage. Further, the co-accused persons, namely, Manish Singh and Mahendra Singh, have already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated **27.04.2026** passed in **M.Cr.C.A. No. 568/2026**, and the case of the present applicant appears to stand on similar footing. Therefore, this Court is inclined to extend the benefit of parity to the present applicant. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is inclined to **allow** the application and grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.
7. Accordingly, the instant MCRCA is **allowed** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant – **Ram Kumar Sahu** on executing a personal bond and one surety in the like sum to the



satisfaction of the arresting Officer, he shall be released on bail

on the following conditions:-

- (a) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such fact to the Court.
- (b) The applicant shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.
- (c) The applicant shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.
- (d) The applicant and the surety shall submit a copy of their adhaar card along with a coloured postcard full size photo having printed the adhaar number on it, which shall be verified by the trial Court.
- (e) The applicant shall not involve himself in any offence of similar nature in future.

8. Office is directed to provide a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance.

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