

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**M. Cr. C. No. 4871 OF 2015**

1. Ravi @ Rajkumar Sahu, S/o Sanat Sahu aged about 27 years

2. Morajdhwaj S/o Keshav Ram Sahu aged about 22 years

Both R/o village Thour P.S. Jamul Tahsil and District Durg (C.G.)

---Applicants**Versus**State of Chhattisgarh, Through District Magistrate Durg (C.G.) Police Station
Jamul, District Durg (C.G.)**---Non-applicant**

For Applicants	:	Mr. Rajesh Jain, Advocate.
For-Non-applicant	:	Mr. S.R.J. Jaiswal, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order on Board****21/09/2015**

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the applicants who have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 279/2015, registered at Police Station Jamul, District Durg (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 392, 341, 294, 506, 323/34, 394 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that, on 08/06/2015 present applicants and two other co-accused persons impersonating themselves as police officers robbed Rs.7,500/- from the complainant Rajesh Singh and thereby committed aforesaid offence.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants would submit that applicants have not committed any offence and have been falsely implicated in offence in question. He would further submit that there is no evidence to connect the

present applicants in offence in question and no T.I. Parade has been convened. He would lastly submit that applicants are in jail since 24/07/2015 & 29/07/2015, therefore, they may be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel would oppose the bail application and submit that amount in question have been recovered and in the T.I. Parade, applicants have been identified.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case; further taking into consideration the nature and gravity of offence; the manner, in which, applicants have robbed Rs.7,500/- from the complainant; consequent recovery from their possession and their identification, this Court is not inclined to release the applicants on regular bail.

7. Accordingly, bail application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. is rejected.

8. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
JUDGE