

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

M.CR.C.(A) No. 1097 of 2015

1. Dhruw Kumar Singh, S/o. Shri Manohar Pratap Singh, aged about 52 years, R/o. Namna Kala, Ambikapur, District Sarguja (C.G.)

----Applicant

Versus

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, Police Station – Podi, District Korla (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. Maneesh Sharma, Advocate

For Respondent/State : Mr. Arvind Shukla, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

18/11/2015

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.113/2015 registered at Police Station- Podi, District – Korla (C.G.), for offence punishable under Section 294, 506, 323, 186, 353, 342, 333 of Indian Penal Code, the applicant has preferred this application for grant of anticipatory bail.
2. As per the prosecution case, it is alleged that on 18.09.2015 at about 3.00 pm the applicant, who is posted as Executive Engineer at Municipal Corporation, Chirmiri entered into the account section, where complainant was working as an Accountant, applicant asked for his status of TA bill and when it was told by the complainant that it is still pending, the applicant started abusing and assaulting him with the means of hand, fist and leg.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit the applicant is working as Executive Engineer at Municipal Corporation, Chirmiri. He would further submit that the complainant is the Accountant in the said corporation and there has been acute subordination and as such there

has been some altercation with respect to the status of the TA bill as the applicant asked for it. The counsel relied on certain documents and communication made to the complainant. Therefore, he prays that the applicant may be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Per contra, the learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail.
5. I have gone through the case diary. Case diary contains written report by the complainant and the report supported by the other statement of the witnesses. Case diary also contains the MLC report which supported that the complainant also sustained fracture on the left finger. Taking into the statement and the medical report, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant, as perusal of case diary would indicate that it is not a case wherein it can be assumed that custodial interrogation may not be required.
6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge