



2026:CGHC:36044



CGHC010262662026



2026:CGHC:36044

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

MCRC No. 6309 of 2026

Shivram Dewangan Son Of Shri Parasram Dewangan, Aged About 45 Years
Resident Of Village Harnadadar, Police Station And Tahsil Bagbahara, District
Mahasamund (C.G.) **... Applicant**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Of Police
Station Bagbahara, District Mahasamund (C.G.) **... Respondent**

For Applicant	: Mr. Shikhar Sharma, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State	: Ms. Ankita Shukla, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

-

13.08.2026

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.09/2026 registered at Police Station – Bagbahara, District Mahasamund (C.G.) for the offences punishable under Section 108 of the BNS.
2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the deceased Padmini after three years of marriage when there was no child born out from the



wedlock, due to the harassment given by the husband and in-laws she committed suicide by consuming poison on 21-04-2025, cause of which the FIR got registered against the present applicant along with other co-status accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The applicant has not acted in the manner alleged by the prosecution and, being the father-in-law of the deceased, he was not directly involved in any act constituting the alleged offence. It is further submitted that the applicant never subjected the deceased to any ill-treatment and that she had no such grievance during her stay at the matrimonial home; rather, the tension, if any, was related to some other issue unrelated to her matrimonial life. The applicant and other family members have been implicated on false allegations and due to pressure upon the police authorities, whereas there is no concrete or reliable evidence available against the applicant. The alleged incident took place in April 2025, whereas the FIR was registered only in January 2026, and the applicant was arrested on 29.05.2026, after a considerable delay, which casts doubt upon the prosecution case and indicates the absence of any direct or specific material against the applicant. The applicant has remained in judicial custody since 29.05.2026, and the trial is likely to take considerable time for its conclusion. The applicant is a permanent resident of the address mentioned in the cause title, there is no likelihood of his absconding, and he is ready and willing to furnish adequate surety and abide by all the conditions that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court; therefore, considering the period of



detention and the facts and circumstances of the case, the applicant may kindly be enlarged on regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, opposes the bail application of the applicant.
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, the nature and gravity of the allegations levelled against the present applicant, the fact that the co-accused, namely Smt. Gangabai Dewangan and Smt. Sangeeta, have already been granted bail vide order dated 28.07.2026 passed in MCRC No. 6793 of 2026, and further considering that the charge-sheet has already been filed before the competent Court, that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 29.05.2026, and that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time, this Court is of the view that the applicant is entitled to be released on bail in the present case.
7. Let applicant, **Shivram Dewangan**, involved in Crime No. 09/2026 registered at Police Station – Bagbahara, District Mahasamund (C.G.) for the offences punishable under Section 108 of the BNS, be released on bail on furnishing **personal bond** with **two local 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, 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.

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

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE