

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**M.CR.C(A) No. 1169 of 2015**

Prashant Sharma, S/o. Shri Ravi Sharma, Aged about 30 years,
R/o. Behind Shyam Nagar High School, Beside Canal Road, Post
Ravigram, Raipur District Raipur (C.G.)

----Applicant**Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, P.S. Pandri,
Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:-	Ms. Fouzia Mirza, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:-	Shri Ramakant Mishra, Dy. Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order on Board****27/11/2015**

1. This application under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. has been filed by the applicant apprehending her arrest in connection with Crime No.145/2015, registered at Police Station Pandri, District – Raipur (C.G.) for offence punishable under Sections 420,467,468,471,34 of IPC

2. As per the prosecution case, the applicant and the other co-accused persons in between from 19.07.2014 to 13.06.2015 has obtained money from different persons to provide government job in Mantralaya. Subsequently, the applicant issued appointment orders to the complainants which was found to be forged. Thereafter, an FIR has been lodged against the applicant for the offence punishable under Sections 420,467,468,471,34 of IPC

3. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has wrongly been inculpated in the crime and only the allegation against the present applicant is that he received the amount at the behest of co-accused

Tarabanjare. She further submits that the applicant only issued cheques as security from his personal account on behalf of co-accused Tarabanjare and the entire amount has been received by co-accused Tarabanjare and therefore, she prays that the applicant may be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail.

6. Considering the fact that charge sheet in this case has already been filed and from perusal of the case diary, it is clear that the applicant has issued forged appointment letter and cheated the complainants, this Court is of the opinion that it is not a fit case where the applicant can be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
JUDGE