



2026:CGHC:3044

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 77 of 2026**

1 - Pameshwar Kunjam S/o Nohar Singh Kunjam, Aged About 18 Years, R/o Village- Gotalguda, Police Station- Mahela, District- Mohla-Manpur-Ambagarh Chowki (C.G.).

... Applicant**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Station House Officer, Police Station- Somni, District- Rajnandgaon (C.G.).

... Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr. Prasoon Agrawal, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Ms. Avelin Juneja, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal**Order on Board****19/01/2026**

1. The accused/applicant has moved this **first** bail application under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, for releasing him on regular bail during trial in connection with Crime No. 154/2024 registered at Police Station – Somni, District – Rajnandgaon (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 147, 364/149, 302/149 and 201 of IPC.
2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that a missing person report was lodged stating that the deceased, Dinesh

Aadil, has been missing since 17.06.2024. On 06.07.2024, the police received information about the deceased's death. During investigation, co-accused Yashwant and Gaurav were arrested and stating in their memorandum statements that they had a dispute with the deceased over drinking alcohol. They allegedly beat the deceased with their hands, fists, and a belt, and then threw him into the Pugaon Canal. Based on their statements, the present applicant was arrested and the aforesaid offences were registered against him.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. It is argued that the applicant's involvement is based solely on the memorandum statements of co-accused persons, without any concrete evidence to support the charges. The evidence collected by the prosecution is prima facie insufficient to establish the applicant's guilt. The applicant has no criminal antecedents, and has been in jail since 08.07.2024. There is no likelihood of his case being decided in the near future, therefore, the present applicant may be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the bail application, submitting that out of total 24 witnesses, only 10 have been examined till date and several important

witnesses remain to be examined, therefore, at this stage, the applicant may not be released on bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, particularly looking to the material available on record and the evidence against the applicant, further considering the fact that out of 24 witnesses, only 10 have been examined till date, and some important witnesses are still remaining for examination, at this stage, I am not inclined to release the applicant on bail.
7. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is **rejected**.
8. However, considering the fact that the applicant is in jail since 08.07.2024 about 01 years 06 months. It is an exceptional case, therefore, concerned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as early as possible preferably within a period of 05 months.
9. Office is directed to sent a certified copy of this order to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge