

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

M.Cr.C. (A) No. 1115 /2015

Sanket Rajpurohit, S/o. Narayan Singh Rajpurohit, Aged About 24 Years,
R/o. Jawahar Para, Balod, P.S. Balod, Civil & Rev. Distt. Balod,
Chhattisgarh. Proprietor Charbhuj Sweets, Madhu Chowk, Balod, P.S. &
Distt. Balod, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Station House Officer, P.S. Balod, Distt.
Balod, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. Purnendra Khichariya, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. Vivek Singhal, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

19/11/2015

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.467/2015 registered at Police Station- Balod, District Balod (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 8/20 of Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substance Act, the applicant has preferred this application under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail.
2. As per the prosecution case, in brief, the police has conducted a raid at Balod and 160 gms of cannabis was seized from the shop thereafter on being enquiry the Proprietor of the shop stated that the cannabis might have kept by some of the customer and it is further stated that the applicant is being inculpated in such crime to due business rivalry.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the cannabis which was recovered from the shop of the applicant do not belong to him and the police authorities under the hand in glove with other has

tried to catch hold and create pressure of this applicant because of business rivalry.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and it is submitted that the matter is still under investigation.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. On Perusal of the case diary and the documents, it is found that the primary investigation is going on and still the culprits are apprehended and considering the documents available, 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. Consequently, I am not inclined to allow the application.
7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge