



2026:CGHC:31354



CGHC010253402026



2026:CGHC:31354

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 6329 of 2026

Ratiram Yadav S/o Sahdev Yadav Aged About 25 Years R/o Village Banbandha, Out Post - Chaitma, Police Station - Katghora, District Korba Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station - Pali (Wrongly Mentioned As Katghora In The Order Sheet) District Korba Chhattisgarh

... Respondent/State

For Applicant	:Mr. Chandrikaditya Pandey along Mr. Kanhaiya Ram Yadav, Advocates.
For Respondent/State	:Ms. Deepa Singh, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal

Order on Board

22.07.2026

1. The accused/applicant has moved this **Second** bail application under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for releasing him on regular bail during trial in connection with Crime No. 432/2025 registered at Police Station – Pali, District – Korba (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 75, 351(2) of BNS, Sections 67, 67(B) of I.T. Act and Section 12 of POCSO Act.



2. The first bail application filed by the applicant was dismissed on merits by this Court on 10.03.2026 in MCRC No. 1665 of 2026, as the trial had not commenced at the relevant time.
3. As per the prosecution's case, it is alleged against the present applicant that on 30.11.2025, the applicant made some obscene photographs of the victim viral via Instagram through a mobile phone and she was threatened and called her into the forest for sexual harassment. Based on this, offence has been registered against the present applicant.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. They further submit that a material change in circumstances has occurred inasmuch as 3 out of the 11 prosecution witnesses, the victim, her father and mother have been examined as PWs-1, 2 & 3 respectively. It is further submitted that as per the testimony of the victim, she informed her father about the alleged incident on 30.11.2025, however, the testimony of her father reveals that the FIR was lodged only after an unexplained and considerable delay, thereby giving rise to a material inconsistency in the prosecution case. The applicant has no criminal antecedents and has been in jail since 20.12.2025 and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, therefore, the present applicant may be released on bail.
5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application and submits that at the time of incident, the victim was a minor girl and she further submits that the trial has already been commenced and out of the 11 prosecution witnesses, only 3 have been



examined so far, the victim and her father and mother as PWs- 1, 2 & 3 and have supported the prosecution case, therefore, at this stage, he may not be enlarged on bail.

6. Pursuant to the order dated 16.07.2026 passed by this Court, the victim and her father appeared through V.C. from the concerned DLSA and raised objection to grant of bail to the applicant.
7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the offence and the alleged change in circumstances, this Court, upon perusal of the court statements of the victim, her father and mother does not find any substantial change in circumstances to justify grant of bail, at this stage, I am not inclined to release the applicant on bail.
9. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is **rejected**.
10. However, considering the fact that the applicant is in jail since 20.12.2025, therefore, concerned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as early as possible preferably within a period of 04 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
11. Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-

(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge