



2026:CGHC:27253



2026:CGHC:27253

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 5842 of 2026

Rupesh Verma S/o. Ganesh Ram Verma, Aged About 25 Years R/o Labor Colony Akaltara, Police Station Akaltara, District Janjgir- Champa (C.G.)

... Applicant(s)

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Mulmula Janjgir - Champa (C.G.)

... Non-applicant(s)

For Applicant	: Mr. Hemant Kumar Sahu, Advocate along with Mr. Syed Afaque Hussain Rizvi, Adv.
For Non-applicant/State	: Mr. Shubham Bajpai, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

02/07/2026

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No. 115/2026 registered at Police Station- Mulmula, District- Janjgir- Champa (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 109(1), 324(4) of B.N.S. and Section 3 of Explosive Substance Act 1908.
2. Case of the prosecution in brief is that the complainant, namely Bhupendra Kumar Sahu, lodged a report at Police Station Mulmula



stating that he resides on rent beside the State Bank at Banahil in Raghuvir Chall and runs a Vedant Service CSC Centre in the front portion of the premises while residing with his family in the rear portion. On 04.04.2026, at about 3:30 P.M., Ganeshi Bai Kewat, a resident of Village Dhardei, informed him that her daughter, Tulsi Kewat, who was married and residing at Village Pakaria, wished to return to her parental home as her husband, Raman Kumar Kewat, used to assault and harass her. Thereafter, Tulsi's father-in-law, Chandrabhan Kewat, took her to Village Dhardei on a motorcycle, which allegedly enraged Raman Kumar Kewat, who thereafter entered into an altercation with the complainant. It is further alleged that at about 11:45 P.M., upon hearing the sound of the shutter of his shop opening and closing, the complainant came out and noticed a burning object inside the shop. On picking it up, he found it to be a detonator and immediately threw it outside the shop, where it exploded with great force, causing damage to the computer, CPU, chair, rack and printer kept inside the shop, resulting in a loss of approximately ₹90,000/-. It is further alleged that the complainant's nephew, who was present at the spot, informed him that the person with whom the complainant had quarrelled earlier had ignited the detonator and thrown it inside the shop through the shutter. On the basis of the said report, the aforesaid crime was registered. During the course of investigation, the present applicant came to be implicated on the basis of the memorandum statement of the co-accused and was thereafter arrested and sent to judicial custody for the aforesaid offences.



3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that no incriminating article has been seized from the possession of the applicant and he has been implicated merely on the basis of suspicion. It is further submitted that the applicant has been arrayed as an accused solely on the basis of the memorandum statement of the co-accused and there is no independent material connecting him with the commission of the alleged offence. He further submits that the applicant was not present at the place of occurrence and has no role in the alleged incident. It is further submitted that the applicant is a young student having no criminal antecedents and has not committed the alleged offence. He also submits that the material collected during the course of investigation is not sufficient to prima facie establish the involvement of the applicant in the alleged crime. It is lastly submitted that the applicant is in judicial custody since 06.04.2026 and the has no criminal antecedents, trial is likely to take some more time therefore, he prays for grant of bail.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature. It is submitted that due to the explosion caused by the detonator, the complainant suffered damage to his shop and articles kept therein to the tune of approximately ₹90,000/-. It is further submitted that though the injured sustained only simple injuries, the act alleged against the accused persons involved the use of explosive substance, thereby endangering the



life and safety of the public. It is further submitted that the present applicant has been implicated during the course of investigation on the basis of the memorandum statement of the co-accused and the material collected during investigation supports the prosecution case. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the damage caused to the complainant's shop and the manner in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, it is prayed that the application for grant of bail deserves to be rejected.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the allegations and the fact that so far as the present applicant is concerned, his name has surfaced during the course of investigation on the basis of the memorandum statement of the co-accused, no incriminating article has been seized from his possession, the injured is reported to have sustained only simple injuries and the applicant has no criminal antecedents and charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court, no further custodial interrogation of the applicant is required and the applicant is in judicial custody since 06.04.2026 and the case of the applicant is better than the case of main accused and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, therefore, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, this Court is inclined to allow the present application.
7. Accordingly, the bail application of the applicant is **allowed**.
8. Let the applicant –**Rupesh Verma**, involved in Crime No. 115/2026



registered at Police Station- Mulmula, District- Janjgir-Champa (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 109(1), 324(4) of B.N.S. and Section 3 of Explosive Substance Act 1908., be released on bail on his furnishing a **personal bond** with **two sureties**, in the like sum to the satisfaction of the Court concerned with the following conditions:-

- (i) The applicant shall file an undertaking to the effect that he shall not seek any adjournment on the dates fixed for evidence when the witnesses are present in court. In case of default of this condition, it shall be open for the trial court to treat it as abuse of liberty of bail and pass orders in accordance with law.
- (ii) The applicant shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through his counsel. In case of his absence, without sufficient cause, the trial court may proceed against him under Section 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
- (iii) In case, the applicant misuses the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure his presence, proclamation under Section 84 of BNSS. is issued and the applicant fails to appear before the court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against him, in accordance with law, under Section 209 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
- (iv) The applicant shall remain present, in person,



2026:CGHC:27253

before the trial court on the dates fixed for (i) opening of the case, (ii) framing of charge and (iii) recording of statement under Section 351 of BNSS. If in the opinion of the trial court absence of the applicant is deliberate or without sufficient cause, then it shall be open for the trial court to treat such default as abuse of liberty of bail and proceed against him in accordance with law.

9. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court for necessary information and compliance.

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

Kunal