

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

M.CR.C.(A) No. 958 of 2015

1. Alok Kumar Bhadra, S/o. Late Shri Sudhir Kumar Bhadra, Aged about 71 years, R/o. 65, Sector-2, Devendra Nagar, Raipur (C.G.)

----Applicant

Versus

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, Through : Station House Officer, Police Station – Gol Bazar, District Raipur (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Ms. Fouzia Mirza, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Mr. O.P. Sahu, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

18/11/2015

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.108/2015 registered at Police Station- Gol Bazar, Raipur, District – Raipur (C.G.), for offence punishable under Section 420/34 of IPC, the applicant has preferred this application for grant of anticipatory bail.
2. As per the prosecution case, a written report was made by the complainant, Alakhram Sahu alleging that from the year 1997 to 2000 Grindless Forestry India Ltd and from 2000 to 2001 Grindless Projects and Developers Ltd. company Amritshar Punjab conducted its work in the State of C.G., wherein the applicant was one of the director. Alongwith the applicant, other directors were also there and amount of Rs.8.00 crores were deposited in the account of the company. As per the scheme of the company it used to maintain RD and FD accounts. As per RD account, Rs.500/- pm was to be deposited for a period of six years, totalling Rs.36,000/- and the company used to return Rs.54,750/- to the account holder and Rs.20,000/- was deposited in

their FD account which after the period of 5-1/2 years used to get double and returned the account holder. Subsequently, in the year 2009 all the companies were closed and the companies name was also changed to Gramin Projects and Infra Developers Ltd and one Krish Prasad Chandrakar stepped into the shoes.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. She would further submit that the applicant had already resigned in the year 2009 and he has published about his resignation. She would further submit that all the agents have also entered into compromise, who had made the reports. Therefore, the counsel would submit 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.
5. Perusal of the case file would show that the lands were purchased in the name of the applicant from the amount received from depositor and taking into the document seized it appears that deposits were made from the different persons with assurance to pay back the amount by the company. Simple resignation from the post of director may not absolve him from the alleged offence. Case diary shows huge amount were got invested from public at large, therefore, any in house compromise by the agents would not absolve the persons from crime, therefore, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant, as perusal of case diary would indicate that it is not a case wherein it can be assumed that custodial interrogation may not be required.
6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge