



NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRC No. 10544 of 2025**

**1** - Ranvir Singh S/o Mukhtar Singh Aged About 42 Years R/o P.S. Kang, Govindwal Saheb, District Taran Taaran, Punjab.

**2** - Jagdeep Singh S/o Late Sukhdev Singh Aged About 30 Years R/o Manuchar, Chowki Chamki, Police Station And District Taran Taaran, Punjab.

**... Applicant(s)****versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Jashpur, District Jashpur, Chhattisgarh.

**... Respondent(s)**

---

For Applicant(s) : Mr. Anshul Tiwari, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. S.S. Baghel, G.A.

---

**Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**  
**Order on Board**

**22/06/2026**

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the applicants who have been arrested in

connection with Crime No. 263/2025 registered at Police Station Jashpur, District Jashpur (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 34(1) and 34(2) of the C.G. Excise Act.

- 2.** Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 07.10.2025, acting upon information received from the CID, the police of Police Station Jashpur intercepted a vehicle bearing registration No. RJ-09-GE-0124 and recovered a huge quantity of illicit liquor from its possession. During the search, 2478 bottles of 750 ml, 1332 bottles of 375 ml, and 576 bottles of 180 ml liquor, total 2,461.68 bulk liters of liquor were allegedly seized, having an approximate total value of Rs. 22,22,168/-. On the basis of the said recovery, an FIR was registered against the applicant for the offences punishable under Sections 34(1) and 34(2) of the Chhattisgarh Excise Act, and the applicant was arrested on 07.10.2025. Hence, the bail application.
- 3.** Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants have been falsely implicated in this case and 2,461.68 bulk liters of liquor were not seized from the exclusive possession of the applicant. He further submits that under Section 34(2) of the C.G. Excise Act, minimum punishment is one year and maximum punishment is three years. He also submits that the applicants have no criminal antecedent, the applicants are in jail since 07.10.2025 and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take quite

long time. Therefore, he prays for grant of regular bail to the applicants.

4. Learned counsel for the State/non-applicant would oppose the bail application and submit that the charge-sheet has been filed in the present case before the competent Court and total 2,461.68 bulk liters of illicit liquor were recovered from the joint possession of the applicants. He further submits that though on the last date of hearing i.e. 15.06.2026, the learned State counsel had submitted that applicant No. 2, Jagdeep Singh, has 19 criminal antecedents, pursuant to the order of this Court, the concerned Superintendent of Police has filed an affidavit clarifying that the said criminal antecedents do not pertain to applicant No. 2, further as per information received from the State of Punjab, there is one previous criminal antecedent of applicant No.1, Ranvir Singh.
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 allegation levelled against the applicants and the fact that the applicant No.2 has no criminal antecedent and applicant No.1 has only one criminal antecedent in the State of Punjab, further the applicants are in jail since 07.10.2025 and the charge-sheet has been filed, the conclusion of the trial may take some more time, as such, this Court is of the view that the applicants are entitled to be released on bail in this case.

7. Accordingly, the application is **allowed**.

8. Let the applicants - **Ranvir Singh** and **Jagdeep Singh**, involved in Crime No. 263/2025 registered at Police Station Jashpur, District Jashpur (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 34(1) and 34(2) of the C.G. Excise Act, be released on bail on their furnishing a **personal bond** with **two sureties each** in the like sum to the satisfaction of the Court concerned with the following conditions:-

(i) The applicants shall file an undertaking to the effect that they 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 applicants shall remain present before the trial court on each date fixed, either personally or through their counsel. In case of their absence, without sufficient cause, the trial court may proceed against him under Section 269 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(iii) In case, the applicants misuse the liberty of bail during trial and in order to secure their presence, proclamation under Section 84 of BNSS. is issued and the applicants fail to appear before the court on the date fixed in such proclamation, then, the trial court shall initiate proceedings against them, in accordance with law, under Section 209 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

(iv) The applicants 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 applicants are 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 them in accordance with law.

9. Before parting with the case, it is note worthy to mention here that during the course of hearing of the present bail application, learned State counsel had informed this Court that applicant No.2, Jagdeep Singh, was having criminal antecedents in 19 cases, whereas the said applicant had filed an affidavit stating that no criminal antecedents were pending against him. In view thereof, vide order dated 15.06.2025, this Court directed the concerned Superintendent of Police to file a personal affidavit verifying the aforesaid fact. In compliance to the same, an affidavit has been filed by the Senior Superintendent of Police, District Jashpur (C.G.), wherein it has been stated that the information regarding 19 criminal antecedents allegedly pertaining to applicant No.2, as furnished by the Station House Officer, Police Station Jashpur, was based upon an incorrect report submitted by ASI Manoj Bhagat and, upon verification, the said information was found to be wrong.

10. The affidavit filed by the Senior Superintendent of Police, Jashpur, District – Jashpur (C.G.) is quoted herein below:

*“1. That, I am posted as the Senior Superintendent of Police, Jashpur, District Jashpur (C.G.) and duly authorized to swear this affidavit on behalf of the Non Applicants/State in compliance of the Hon'ble Court's order/direction dated 15.06.2026 and as such fully conversant with the facts of the case.*

*2. That, the subject case came up for hearing before the Hon'ble Court on 15.06.2026 and after hearing of this matter, the Hon'ble Court has been pleased to direct the concerned Superintendent of Police to file his personal affidavit indicating whether the 19 criminal antecedents reported against the present Applicant No. 2. Jagdeep Singh, in fact pertain to the present applicant or not. Therefore, in compliance whereof, the instant affidavit is being filed before this Hon'ble Court for its kind perusal and consideration.*

*3. That, in compliance of the Hon'ble Court's direction, the Deponent most humbly and respectfully submits that, a report has been called from the concerned Station House Officer, Police Station Jashpur, District Jashpur and the concerned Station House Officer has informed the Deponent vide its letter dated 20.06.2026, after due search in the ICJS Portal, no previous criminal antecedents of the present accused applicants have been found. However, as per the information received from the State of Punjab, there is one previous criminal antecedent of the present accused Applicant No. 1/Ranvir Singh Slo Mukhtar Singh, was found to be registered. It is also informed that, in compliance of the demand diary dated*

*09.12.2025 of the subject crime number, the Investigating Officer of the case, ASI Manoj Bhagat without bringing the same to his notice, carelessly prepared the information about the previous criminal antecedents of the present accused applicants and sent to the Office of the Advocate General, Chhattisgarh, Bilaspur. Copy of the report dated 20.06.2026, is being annexed herewith as Annexure R/1 for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court. However, it is also humbly submitted that, no criminal antecedents reported against the present accused Applicant No. 2 Jagdeep Singh, in fact pertain to the present accused Applicant No. 1 Ranvir Singh.*

*4. That, it is humbly submitted that, after considering the aforesaid report sent by the concerned SHO, PS Jashpur, the office of the Deponent has passed an order on 21.06.2026 whereby, the concerned Investigating Officer has been punished with a fine of Rs. 500/- for his gross negligence in the case and has been warned for future that, if the said act is repeated, then the strict disciplinary action would be taken against him. Copy of the order dated 21.06.2026, is being annexed herewith as Annexure R/2 for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.*

*5. That, the Deponent herein is duty bound to adhere and comply with the direction issued by this Hon'ble Court from time to time and it shall be his most sincere endeavour to ensure implement action with the coordination of the Police Officials as early as possible and the Deponent further assures this Hon'ble Court that, such mistake will not be repeated in future.*

*6. That, the contents of the attached Affidavit at Paragraphs No. 01 to 05, have been drafted under my instruction and the contents thereof are true and correct on the basis of the records, available in the office.”*

- 11.** It has further been brought to the notice of this Court that the action stated to have been taken against the concerned official was merely the imposition of a fine of Rs.500/-. Prima facie, such action appears to be wholly inadequate and merely an eye-wash in the facts and circumstances of the case. The furnishing of incorrect information before this Court, thereby portraying a person as having multiple criminal antecedents when no such antecedents existed is very serious in nature.
- 12.** In view of the above, the Director General of Police is directed to reconsider the matter afresh against the concerned official and also call and explanation from the Senior Superintendent of Police, Jashpur as to how such a issue was taken by him so lightly, which concerned a wrong information sent to this Court by ASI, Manoj Bhagat.
- 13.** Let the matter be placed before this Court on **8<sup>th</sup> July, 2026**, for compliance of the affidavit.
- 14.** Learned State counsel is directed to communicate this order to the Director General of Police, for necessary information and compliance forthwith.

- 15.** Office is directed to send a certified copy of this order be send to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance.

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

**Akhil**