

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****M.Cr.C.No.1153 of 2016**

Lalit Kumar S/o Prahlad Das Vaishnav, Age-40 years, R/o-Village-Navagaon, Dayali P.S.-Lormi, District-Mungeli (CG)

**---Applicant**

**Versus**

State of Chhattisgarh, Through Station House Officer, Police Station-Lormi, District-Mungeli (CG)

**---Non-applicant**

---

|                   |   |                            |
|-------------------|---|----------------------------|
| For Applicant     | : | Mr. Anish Tiwari, Advocate |
| For Non-applicant | : | Mr. D.R.Minz, Dy.G.A.      |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**

**Order on Board**

**09/03/2016**

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 applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.145/2010, registered at Police Station-Lormi, District-Mungeli (CG), for the offence punishable under Sections 395, 412 and 414 of the IPC.

2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that on 12.5.2010 the applicant and other four co-accused persons committed dacoity in the house of Mathuraprasad Vaishnav and looted golden ornaments and other property worth ₹15,00,000 and thereby committed the aforesaid offences.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant has not committed any offence and he has falsely been implicated in crime in question. He would further submit that the applicant

is in jail since 29.10.2015 and charge-sheet has already been filed, therefore, he may be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail application and submit that incident is of 12.5.2010 and the applicant remained absconding and only by issuance of permanent warrant of arrest he could be arrested on 29.10.2015.

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

6. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the case, nature & gravity of the offence, role of the present applicant and the fact that he was remained absent for five years, I do not find any ground for grant of regular bail to the applicant. Consequently, bail application is rejected.

**Sd/-**

**(Sanjay K. Agrawal)**  
**JUDGE**

B/-