

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

M.CR.C. (A) No. 329 of 2016

Ranjit Singh S/o. Chain Singh, aged about 31 years, R/o. Kashi Nagar,
Korba, Tahsil and District Korba (C.G.)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through – Station House Officer, Police Station-
Kotwali, (outpost Rampur) District Korba (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicant :- Mr. R.S. Baghel, Advocate

For Respondent/State :- Mr. Anil S. Pandey, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

08/04/2016

1. Apprehending in connection with Crime No 65/2016 registered at Police Station- Kotwali, (outpost Rampur) District Korba (C.G.) for the offence punishable under sections 420,34 of Indian Penal Code. The applicant has preferred this application for grant of anticipatory bail.

2. As per the prosecution case, a report was made by Purnima Rathore against the applicant and his wife alleging that the applicant and his wife in order to provide job to the sons of the complainant in Railway took an amount of Rs. 16,70,000/-. However, the job could not be provided to the sons of the complainant. Thereafter, the report was made along with the document to the Police, therefore, the matter is investigated as the crime is committed.

3. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has availed the loan of Rs. 2 lakhs from the complainant Purnima Rathore, though it was returned, still the amount was being claimed along with the interest which inflated to the tune of Rs. 16,70,000/-, therefore, the report was made to the Superintendent of Police and the other officials. Therefore, in order to avoid recovery of such amount, the false report has been made.

4. Per contra, State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail.

5. Perused the statement and the report made by the complainant Purnima Rathore, wherein it is stated that the applicant along with his wife had availed Rs. 16,70,000/- in order to provide job in Railway to the son of the complainant. Perused the case file, wherein admission is made by the wife of the applicant that she availed the amount to provide the job to the sons of the complainant which would be returned in installment. Considering the statement and the various documents, it is not a case where the benefit of section 438 of Cr.P.C. can be extended to the applicant.

6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
JUDGE