



2026:CGHC:656

AFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****MCRCA No. 1996 of 2025**

Sanjeet Kumar Burman S/o Teekaram Burman Aged About 40 Years R/o
Shanti Nagar, Mangla, P.S. - Civil Line, Bilaspur, Tah. And Distt.- Bilaspur
(C.G.)

... Applicant**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S.- Civil Line, Distt.- Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Respondent**MCRCA No. 1999 of 2025**

Amrit Das Dahariya S/o Taran Das Dahariya Aged About 28 Years R/o - Vill.
Piparhatta, Belsari, P.S. - Takhatpur, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

...Applicant**versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. - Civil Line, District - Bilaspur, Chhattis-
garh.

...Non-applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Anchal Kumar Matre, Advocate.

For Non-applicant/State : Mr. Bharat Gulabani, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

06.01.2026

1. This first anticipatory bail application(s) under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short, the BNSS*) has been filed by the applicant(s), who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Crime No.1360/2025 registered at Police Station – Civil Line District – Bilaspur (C.G.) for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 221, 132, 296, 351(2) and 299 of the BNS.
2. The prosecution story, in brief, is that, on 15.11.2025, the police persons of Police Station, Takhatpur had arrested one storyteller (*Kathawachak*) namely Ashutosh Chaitanya who allegedly had made some derogatory remarks about Satnami community while conducting his religious gathering and was presented before learned trial court. While, taking him to court, the present applicant along with other co-accused persons have allegedly tried stopping the police persons and abused Ashutosh Chaitanya and thus have allegedly stopped the police persons from discharging their official public duty.
3. In M.Cr.C.(A) No. 1996/2025, Mr. Anchal Matre, learned counsel for the applicant-Sanjeet Kumar Burman, submits that the applicant innocent and had not committed the alleged crime and the FIR although has been registered prior to the registration of FIR No. 1361/2025 at same Police Station, however was registered as counter-blast under political pressure to dilute the misdeeds of opposite party who are in reality involved in abusing and assaulting the police persons. He would submit that police has also registered an FIR bearing FIR No. 1361/2025

against one Rajeev Sharma and other persons who had initiated the chaos and tried to agitate the persons of Satnami community. He would submit that the applicant had gone to premise beside the court building for his personal work on the date of incident. He has been falsely named in the present FIR. He would submit that the entire incident was recorded by members of media which are available openly in internet. Perusal of video clip will show how the incident took place and who are the actual perpetrators. The present applicant is seen nowhere in the said video. The accused persons in FIR no. 1361/2025 can be seen instigating Satnami Community and intimidating police officers. He would submit that the applicant was earlier a government teacher who had resigned to do social work and is also a book seller. He would submit that the applicant has been falsely implicated due to his social status and his active involvement in social gatherings.

4. With respect to M.Cr.C.(A) No. 1999/2025, Mr. Matre, learned counsel for the applicant-Amrit Das Dahariya submits that applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the present FIR has been lodged as a counter-blast under political pressure to dilute the misconduct of the opposite party, whereas FIR No. 1361/2025 has already been registered against Rajeev Sharma and others who actually created chaos and attempted to instigate members of the Satnami community. The applicant had merely gone near the Court premises for his personal work on the date of the incident and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The entire incident was recorded by the media and is available on the internet, and a perusal of the video footage clearly shows that the applicant was nowhere involved, while the real perpetrators in FIR No. 1361/2025 can be seen intimidating police officials and provoking the crowd, for which a CD and

screenshots have been annexed as Annexure A-3 and A-4. The applicant is a Bachelor of Arts student and is planning to pursue post-graduation, has no previous criminal antecedents, is a permanent resident with deep roots in society, and therefore there is no likelihood of his absconding.

5. Mr. Matre submits that the applicants are ready to furnish adequate surety and undertakes to abide by all the terms and conditions that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court while granting them bail.
6. On the other hand, the learned State Counsel opposes the bail application and submits that the applicant-Amrit Das Dahariya has one criminal antecedent and applicant-Sanjeet Kumar Burman is having six criminal antecedents and they having participated in a demonstration within the Court premises, manhandled police personnel and obstructed them in the discharge of their official duties, therefore, they are not entitled to the grant of anticipatory bail.
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 upon perusal of the material available on record, including the case diary, it emerges that on 15.11.2025 a mob unlawfully gathered within the court premises, staged a demonstration, entered the courtroom, and threatened to kill the accused, Ashutosh Chaitanya, involved in Crime No. 645/2025 registered at Police Station Takhatpur; when the police force intervened to control the situation, the mob allegedly manhandled police personnel and obstructed them in the discharge of their official duties, and the offence registered against the applicant/accused is serious in nature. The Station House Officer, Civil Lines, has further stated in the reply to the bail application that the

present applicant-Amrit Das Dahariya has one criminal antecedent registered at Police Station, Pandri, Raipur bearing Crime No.68/2025 for the offence under Sections 126, 189(2), 190, 353 of the BNS, and the applicant-Sanjeet Kumar Burman has six criminal antecedents registered at various Police Stations namely, Civil Lines, Bilaspur, Civil Lines, Raipur, Police Station Vidhansabha, Raipur, Police Station Pandri, Raipur, bearing crime No. 1127/2021 for the offences under Sections 147, 294, 506 and 427 of the IPC, Crime No. 441/2022 for the offences under Sections 294, 34 of the IPC, Crime No. 950/2022, for the offence under Section 295A of the IPC, Crime No. 1290/2022 for the offence under Sections 147, 419, 420, 447, 448 of the IPC, Crime No. 213/2023, for the offence under Sections 146, 147, 353, 332, 294 IPC, 67A of the IT Act, and Crime No. 68/2025 for the offence under Sections 126, 189(2), 190 and 353 of the BNS and the case diary contains documents substantiating their previous involvement in criminal cases.

9. Although one co-accused, namely Gyanendra Kumar Kosale, has been granted anticipatory bail on the ground that his M.A. 3rd Semester examination is scheduled to commence from 09.01.2026, and that he had no criminal antecedents, the case of the present applicants stand on a different footing in view of their criminal antecedents and the distinct role attributed to them in the incident; therefore, the benefit of parity cannot be extended to them.
10. No individual or group of individuals is permitted to take the law into their own hands under the guise of protest, demonstration, or expression of grievance. The rule of law mandates that disputes and grievances must be addressed strictly through lawful and constitutional

means. Any act of intimidation, obstruction, or violence, particularly against public servants performing their statutory duties, strikes at the very root of the administration of justice. The Court premises, including courtrooms and their immediate precincts, are required to be maintained as neutral, dignified, and inviolable spaces dedicated solely to the administration of justice. They are not meant to be used as venues for protests, demonstrations, or public agitations of any nature. Any unlawful assembly or demonstration within Court premises not only disrupts judicial proceedings but also poses a serious threat to the safety of litigants, advocates, judicial officers, and law enforcement personnel. Such acts, if condoned, would erode public confidence in the justice delivery system and encourage lawlessness. In the present case, the allegations against the applicant disclose that a mob unlawfully assembled within the court premises, entered the courtroom, raised slogans, issued threats to the accused, and obstructed police personnel who were discharging their official duties. Prima facie, such conduct cannot be viewed lightly, particularly when it involves interference with judicial proceedings and physical obstruction of law enforcement officers. The seriousness of the allegations is further aggravated by the fact that the incident occurred at a place where discipline, order, and respect for the rule of law are paramount. Moreover, the presence of a criminal antecedent against the applicant disentitles him from seeking discretionary relief under anticipatory bail, as it reflects adversely on his conduct and raises legitimate apprehension regarding his propensity to repeat such acts or interfere with the investigation. The discretionary relief of anticipatory bail is not meant to shield persons who, prima facie, appear to have participated in acts undermining public order and the sanctity of judicial institutions.

11. Granting anticipatory bail in such circumstances would send a wrong signal to society that unlawful conduct within court premises can be undertaken with impunity. The Court must, therefore, strike a balance between individual liberty and societal interest, and in cases involving disruption of judicial proceedings and obstruction of public servants, the latter must prevail. In view of the seriousness of the allegations, the past conduct of the applicants, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant is not entitled to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

12. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application(s) of the applicant – **Amrit Das Dahariya** and **Sanjeet Kumar Burman**, involved in Crime No. 1360/2025 registered at Police Station – Civil Line District – Bilaspur (C.G.) for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 221, 132, 296, 351(2) and 299 of the BNS, are **rejected**.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Head Note

No individual or group of individuals is permitted to take the law into their own hands under the guise of protest, demonstration, or expression of grievance. The rule of law mandates that disputes and grievances must be addressed strictly through lawful and constitutional means. Any act of intimidation, obstruction, or violence, particularly against public servants performing their statutory duties, strikes at the very root of the administration of justice. The discretionary relief of anticipatory bail is not meant to shield persons who, *prima facie*, appear to have participated in acts undermining public order and the sanctity of judicial institutions.