

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 4043 of 2015**

- Lalit Kumar, son of Khelawan Sahu, aged about 34 years, resident of Village – Palaud, Police Station – Mandi Hassaud, District Raipur (C.G.), at present Subhash Nagar, Mahasamund, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

---- Applicant**Versus**

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Station House Officer, Police Station – Mahasamund, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

---- Non-applicant

For Applicant: Mr. Vikash Pradhan, Advocate.
 For Non-applicant/State: Mr. Om. P. Sahu, Deputy Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board**18/08/2015**

Heard.

(1) This is an application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested in connection with crime No.78/2013 registered at Police Station Mahasamund, District Mahasamund for the offences punishable under Sections 419,420,467,468/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

(2) Case of the prosecution is that applicant – Lalit Kumar and one Purshottam Satnami prepared forged agreement to sell the land of Sandhya Rani Sahu to Bharosa Yadav and got an amount of ₹ 16,00,700/- delivered by Bharosa Yadav to Tribhuvan Mahilang and Purshottam Satnami; and the applicant stood as

witness in the forged agreement to sell and, thereby committed the aforesaid offences.

(3) Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has not committed any offence and he has been falsely implicated in the offence in question as he only stood as witness in the said agreement to sell and one of the accused namely Purshottam Satnami has already died. He further submits that it is Tribhuvan Mahilang, who has taken the amount and prepared forged agreement to sell and, therefore, the applicant may be released on bail.

(4) On the other hand, counsel for the State submits that it is that applicant and Purshottam Satnami, who not only prepared forged agreement to sell but also got an amount of ₹ 16,00,700/- delivered by Bharosa Yadav to Tribhuvan Mahilang and, therefore, the applicant is not entitled to be released on bail.

(5) Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the case; and the manner in which the offence is said to have been committed by the applicant; his role in the offence in question; and the other material collected by the prosecution, I am not inclined to release the applicant on bail. Thus, the bail application is rejected.

Certified copy, as per rules.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-

