



1

MCRC-25328-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUBODH ABHYANKAR

ON THE 10th OF JULY, 2025

MISC. CRIMINAL CASE No. 25328 of 2025

NANDKISHORE

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

.....
Appearance:

Shri Abhay Saraswat - Advocate for the applicant.

Shri Vishal Singh Panwar - G.A. for respondent/State.

Objector Shri Darshan Sharma is present in person.

.....
WITH

MISC. CRIMINAL CASE No. 24792 of 2025

SMT. BHARTI REWAL

Versus

SATET OF MADHYA PRADESH

.....
Appearance:

*Shri Ajay Bagadiya - Senior Advocate with Shri Ayush Kumar Choudhary -
Advocate for the applicant.*

Shri Vishal Singh Panwar - G.A. for respondent/State.

Objector Shri Darshan Sharma is present in person.

.....
ORDER

1] They are heard and perused the case diary.

2] This order shall govern the disposal of both the M.Cr.C.
Nos.25328 and 24792 of 2025, as both the cases have arisen out of the same
Crime No.42 of 2025, registered at Police Station - Baghana, District



Neemuch.

3] Both these applications are the first bail applications filed by applicants Nandkishore and Bharti Rawal under Section 483 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita*, 2023/ Section 439 of Cr.P.C. respectively as they are implicated in connection with Crime No.42/2025 registered at Police Station Baghana, District- Neemuch (MP) for offence punishable under Sections 61(2), 111(3), 318(2), 336(3), 337, 338 & 340 of B.N.S., 2023. The applicants are in custody since 14.05.2025.

4] Allegations against the applicants are that the applicant Nandkishore being the Secretary of Gram Panchayat Nevad, Tehsil Neemuch, and the applicant Bharti Rawal being Sarpanch of the said Gram Panchayat, forged a *Patta* in favour of one Sita Bai W/o Surajmal Banjara, which was sold to other persons for a consideration of Rs.5,08,000/-, and it is alleged that had the said *Patta* been not prepared by the present applicants, the Government could not have suffered the loss.

5] Counsel for the applicants have submitted that the charge-sheet has already been filed, and the applicants are lodged in jail since 14.05.2025, and the final conclusion of trial is likely to take sufficient long time. Thus, it is prayed that both the applications be allowed.

6] Counsel for the State as also the objector have opposed the prayer, and it is submitted that looking to the conduct of the applicants, no case for grant of bail is made out.

7] Having considered the rival submissions, and on perusal of the case-diary, it is apparent that a *Patta* has been issued by the applicants in



favour of Sita Bai of 7800 square feet land, and it is alleged that the said *Patta* has been issued illegally by the applicants. Since the case involves documentary evidence, and the validity of the *Patta* is to be examined by the trial Court after the evidence is led by the parties. In such circumstances, further custody of the applicants do not appear necessary.

8] Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, both the application filed by the applicants are hereby **allowed**. The applicants are directed to be released on bail upon furnishing a personal bond in the sum of **Rs.25,000/- (rupees twenty five thousand) each** with separate solvent surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court for their regular appearance before the trial Court during trial with a condition that they shall remain present before the Court concerned during trial and shall also abide by the conditions enumerated under Section 437 (3) Criminal Procedure Code, 1973.

9] Accordingly, both the application are **allowed** and **disposed of**.

C.c. as per rules.

(SUBODH ABHYANKAR)
JUDGE