

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

M.CR.C.(A) No. 1206 of 2015

1. Amit Pandey, S/o. Late Om Prakash Pandey, aged about 31 years, R/o. 292 Development Authority Jaideo Park, Punjabi Bag, Police Station- Punjabi Bag, Delhi-26.

Present Address : Through Kundan Kumar Sharma M.I.G. 796, Virsavarkar Nagar, Police Station : Kabir Nagar, Tahsil and District – Raipur (C.G.)

----Applicant

Versus

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, through, S.H.O., Police Station – Telibandha, Raipur, District – Raipur (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr. C.R. Sahu, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Mr. O.P. Sahu, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

03/12/2015

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.294/2015 registered at Police Station- Telibandha, Raipur, District – Raipur (C.G.), for offence punishable under Section 420, 467, 468, 471, 34 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 a report was made by the complainant, Vikram Singh that applicant alongwith one another co-accused namely Shyam Sunder in order to provide the job to the complainant in the home department to the post of computer operator obtained an amount of Rs.8.00 lakhs and also imparted training by the same. Subsequently it was found that forgery has been committed.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that, the applicant has not obtained any amount and it is a loan transaction, the co-accused has obtained loan from this applicant and no amount was ever paid to the applicant, which goes to prove that he has not received any amount. 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 and would submit that the applicant has declared absconded and the charge sheet in this case has been filed, therefore, he may not be released on anticipatory bail.
5. I have perused the case diary and the documents. Perusal of the statements of the complainant would show that Shyam Sunder alongwith the present applicant assured to provide job of computer operator and thereafter, received the amount and the amount was paid in the account of the applicant and co-accused. Taking into the documents and the evidence and the fact that the applicant is absconding, it appears that custodial interrogation of the applicant may be required. Therefore, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.
6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge