



2026:CGHC:27987



CGHC010254592026



2026:CGHC:27987

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1025 of 2026

1 - Thanesh Sahu S/o Shri Jawahirlal Sahu Aged About 42 Years R/o Vill- Khorsi, P.S. Shivrinarayan, Distt- Janjgir- Champa (C.G.) Present R/o Old Hospital Colony Janjgir, P.S. And Tah- Janjgir- Distt- Janjgir- Champa (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through S.H.O. P.S. Mahila Police Thana, Janjgir- Distt- Janjgir- Champa (C.G.)

... Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. R. Sharma, Advocate.

For Non-Applicant/State : Ms. Palak Dwivedi, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

07.07.2026

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 his arrest in connection with Crime No. 12/2026 registered at Police Station – Mahila Police Thana, Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.) for the offences punishable under Sections 64(2) (m) and 351 (3) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the complainant/victim lodged a complaint on 22.06.2026 at Mahila Police Station, Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.) stating therein that she is about 37 years of age, a married woman, and the mother of two children. Owing to certain disputes with her husband, she has been residing with her mother. She has been working as a cook at the residence of the Additional Collector and District Magistrate and also works as a beautician by providing beauty services on a door-to-door basis. It is alleged that an Old Medical Hospital is situated near her colony and that one Dr. Thanshwar Sahu, an Eye Specialist, resides in a government quarter within the hospital campus. According to the complainant, she had visited the doctor's residence on the request of his wife to provide beautician services. During one such visit, the applicant allegedly made obscene gestures towards her, as a result of which she stopped visiting his residence. Thereafter, the applicant allegedly started following her. The complainant further alleged that the applicant came to know that she was also working as a cook at the residence of one Mahobia Babu and that Mahobia Babu usually left for work between 10:00 and 11:00 a.m. and returned late at



night. After getting such information, the applicant allegedly forcefully entered the house of Mahobia Babu on 30.11.2025 and committed forcible sexual intercourse with the complainant. It is further alleged that the said incident was captured by the CCTV cameras installed at the premises. The complainant further stated that on two or three occasions she had shouted at the applicant. It is further alleged that on 08.05.2026, the applicant again came to the house of Mahobia Babu and again committed forcible sexual intercourse with the complainant. Thereafter, the complainant informed Mahobia Babu about the incidents, and on his advice she lodged the present FIR against the applicant. The complainant further alleged that the applicant had threatened to kill her if she lodged any complaint against him.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. It has been argued by learned counsel that the applicant is a Govt. doctor and the victim is a married woman aged 37 years having 02 children who used to work as a cook in the house of one Mahobia Babu. It has been stated that on 30.11.2025, the applicant committed rape upon the victim and because of fear she did not inform any person about the said incident. It has been further stated that on 2-3 occasions, the victim resisted the act of the applicant and on 08.05.2026, the applicant again visited the house of said Mahobia Babu and committed rape with the victim, however, the present FIR has been lodged after 1 ½ months of the second incident just



to implicate the applicant in a false criminal case to avoid the return of loan amount of Rs.65,000/- which was borrowed by victim from the wife of the applicant. He also submits that the present applicant has no criminal antecedents except the present, therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, appearing for the non - applicant/State, opposes the bail application of the present applicant.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submission of the learned counsel for the parties, material available on record, considering the nature of allegation levelled against the applicant, and also considering the fact that investigation and trial are likely to take some time, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the present applicant.
7. Accordingly, the instant MCRCA is **allowed** and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicant – **Thanesh 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) he 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) he shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.

(c) he 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 his 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) he shall not involve himself in any offence of similar nature in future.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE