

(2026) 02 MP CK 1791

In the Madhya Pradesh High Court, Indore Bench

Case No : Criminal Appeal No. 972, 1338 Of 2026

Sonu @ Nilesh Verma And Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Madhya Pradesh And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 18-02-2026

Acts Referred:

Scheduled Castes And The Scheduled Tribes (Prevention Of Atrocities) Act, 1989 —
Section 3(1)(r), 3(2)(v), 14A(2)
Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 — Section 480(3)
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 — Section 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 191(2), 191(3),
296, 351(3)

Citation : (2026) 02 MP CK 1791

Hon'ble Judges : Gajendra Singh, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Shivendra Pandey, Prashant Jain, Shubham Arya, Rishiraj Trivedi

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Gajendra Singh, J

1. Both are first criminal appeal under section 14A (2) of the SC & ST (Prevention of Atrocities Act, 1989 is preferred against the order dated 14.01.2026 in SCATR No.07/2026 and order dated 13.01.2026 in BA No.11/2026 by the Special Judge, SC & ST (POA) Act, 1989, Barwani (MP), whereby the application for bail on behalf of appellant apprehended on 15.12.2025 and 17.09.2025 in connection with Crime No.344/2025 registered at police station-Sendhwa City, District Barwani(M.P.) for the offence punishable under sections 296, 115(2), 118(2), 191(2), 191(3), 351(3), 118(1) of the BNS, 2023 and sections 3(1)(r) and 3(2)(v) of SC/ST Act, 1989 have been rejected.

2.The allegations against the appellants are on 17/09/2025 Minaksi Koli reported that several men, including Shailendra Bate assaulted Lucky and Pawan over a dispute and bystanders intervened and the victims were taken to the Barwani for treatment.

3. Counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants are innocent and they have falsely been implicated in this case. There is no necessity for appellant's custodial interrogation. It is further submitted that compromise has been arrived between complainant and the appellants. The investigation is over and charge sheet has been filed. The conclusion of trial will likely to take long time, hence prays for release of the appellant on bail.

4. Counsel for the State opposed the criminal appeal.

5. Counsel for the complainant submits that he has no objection if appellants are enlarged on bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the no objection of the complainant, without commenting on the merit of the case, the appeal is allowed and the impugned order is set aside and the appellants- SONU @ NILESH VERMA & SAGAR KOLI are directed to be released on bail subject to their furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) each with separate sureties in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial court for their appearance before that Court, as and when directed, during the pendency of trial and shall also abide by the conditions enumerated under section 480 (3) of the BNSS, 2023.