



CGHC010235072026

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPCR No. 377 of 2026

Kishore Sahu **Versus** State Of Chhattisgarh

Order Sheet

10.07.2026	Mr. Ghanshyam Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the arguing counsel, Mr. Shyam Manohar, was to appear through Video Conferencing, however, he is unwell today and, therefore, prays for adjournment of the matter to next week. On the other hand, Mr. Soumya Rai, learned Deputy Government Advocate appearing for the respondent/State, draws the attention of this Court to the earlier order dated 16.04.2026 passed in CRMP No. 1066/2026, which reveals that the said petition had been filed substantially for the same cause of action, seeking quashment of the order framing charge dated



	10.12.2024, besides seeking quashment of the FIR and the charge-sheet. The said petition came to be dismissed by this Court vide order dated 16.04.2026. Learned State counsel further points out that the petitioner challenged the aforesaid order before the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing a Special Leave Petition, which also came to be dismissed vide order dated 25.05.2026. Having considered the submissions advanced and upon perusal of the record, this Court finds that the present petition appears to have been filed substantially on the same cause of action which had already been adjudicated by this Court in CRMP No. 1066/2026. It is also evident from the order dated 16.04.2026 that Mr. Shyam Manohar, learned counsel, had appeared through Video Conferencing and argued the matter on behalf of the petitioner. Despite the dismissal of the earlier petition by this Court and the subsequent dismissal of the Special Leave Petition by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the present petition has
--	---



Manpreet	been instituted seeking substantially the same reliefs. In such circumstances, this Court is prima facie of the opinion that the conduct of filing the present petition on the same cause of action requires an explanation. Accordingly, Mr. Shyam Manohar, learned counsel for the petitioner, shall explain as to why costs should not be imposed upon him for filing a second petition on the same cause of action and why the matter should not be referred to the State Bar Council for examining whether he acted in accordance with his professional obligations while advising and instituting the present proceedings. List the matter on 13.07.2026 for further consideration and for the aforesaid explanation. <table><tr><td>Sd/-</td><td>Sd/-</td></tr><tr><td>(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)</td><td>(Ramesh Sinha)</td></tr><tr><td>Judge</td><td>Chief Justice</td></tr></table>	Sd/-	Sd/-	(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)	(Ramesh Sinha)	Judge	Chief Justice
Sd/-	Sd/-						
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)	(Ramesh Sinha)						
Judge	Chief Justice						