

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRC No. 6596 of 2015

- Ravishwar Panna S/o Shri Bajar Panna Aged About 28 Years
R/o Village- Sonajori, P.S.- Kapu, Tahsil- Dharamjaygarh, Civil
& Revenue District- Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
--- Petitioner

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh Through, Station House Officer, Police
Station- Kapu, District- Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
--- Respondent

MCRC No. 6597 of 2015

- Ravishwar Panna S/o Bajar Panna Aged About 28 Years R/o
Village Sonajori, P.S. Kapu, Tah. Dharamjaygarh, Civil & Rev.
Distt. Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
--- Petitioner

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, P.S.
Kapu, Distt. Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
---- Respondent

For the applicant(s)	:	Mr. Kaushal Dewangan	Advocate
For the Respondent	:	Mr. Anant Bajpai,	Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

02.12.2015

1. These are two bail applications filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking grant of regular bail to the applicant Ravishwar Panna.
2. M.Cr.C.No. 6596 of 2015 is relating to crime No.66/2015 and M.Cr.C.No.6597 of 2015 is relating to Crime No.65/2015 registered at P.S. Kapu, District Raigarh (C.G). As the applicant is involved in similar nature of offences punishable u/ss 363, 370, 371, 374/34 IPC in both these cases, they are decided together by this common order.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 26.07.2015, the complainants Rijhan Uraon and Sukhlal Uraon lodged reports stating that the applicant along-with other co-accused had taken their minor daughters Ku. Manisha Uraon and Ku. Ranjati Uraon from their home for engaging in house hold works at Raipur, Delhi. Thereafter on reports being made, the statements were recorded and the charge sheets have been filed.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the charge sheets has been filed and there is no allegation or statement in the challan against the present applicant as to whether he has played any specific role in taking away the girls from the lawful guardianship of their parents, therefore, no offence is made out against the applicant. He further submits that co-accused Kaleshwar has been enlarged on bail by this Court in M.Cr.C.No.5776/2015 on 02.11.2015 by this Court and this applicant is in jail since 27.07.2015, therefore, he may be enlarged on bail.
5. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposes the bail applications. After verification he submits that similarly placed co-accused has been enlarged on bail by this Court in M.Cr.C.No.5776/2015 vide order dated 02.11.2015.
6. Considering the statements made under Section 164 Cr.P.C., recorded before the Magistrate wherein certain contradictions are there and also considering the fact that the similarly placed co-accused Kaleshwar has been granted bail, I am inclined to release this applicant also on regular bail.
7. Accordingly, the bail applications are allowed and the applicant is directed to be released on bail on his executing a personal bond in sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety in the

like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court. He is also directed to appear before the trial Court as and when directed by the said Court.

8. C.c. as per rules.

Sd/-
GOUTAM BHADURI
JUDGE

Rao