

COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

M.Cr.C. (A) No. 194 /2016

Gajendra Sharma, S/o. Late Ramesh Sharma, Aged About 42 Years, R/o. Mishan Road, Korba, Tahsil & District Korba, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh, Through : Police Station Kotwali, District Korba, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. Samir Singh, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. Gary Mukhopadhyay, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

14/03/2016

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.417/2015 registered at Police Station- Out Post- Rampur, Thana Kotwali, District Korba (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420, 467, 468, 471, 120(B)/ 34 of Indian Penal Code, 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, one Vinod Kumar Sahu and Rajkumar Sharma who are working in the Ayurved Hospital asked Pawan Kumar Yadav to bring candidates to get them employed and in lieu thereof they charged huge amount in total Rs.22 to 25 Lakhs from different candidates and thereafter fake appointment letters were issued to the candidates. It is the allegation against this applicant that he provided the rubber seal and had scribed the signature of District Ayurved Officer, Korba.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that no allegation has been attributed to the applicant and only the allegation that rubber

seal/stamp were provided by this applicant, which was available in the open market; therefore, *prima facie* the allegations are completely fake and therefore the applicant may be enlarged on bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail.
5. Perused the case diary and the documents. Against this applicant the allegation of providing fake rubber seal also coupled with the allegation that he had signed fake signature of the Head of Ayurved Officer in the appointment letters. Taking into such nature of allegation, it is not a case where the custodial interrogation of the applicant may not be required, therefore, I am not inclined to enlarge the applicant on anticipatory bail.
6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge