

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**M.Cr.C.No.1155 of 2016**

Bislal Mehar son of Kurkuru, aged about 44 years, R/o. Village Barda,
Chowki Lawan, P.S.Kasdol, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through: Station House Officer, Police Station–
Kotwali, Balodabazar, District-Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---Non-applicant

And**M.Cr.C.No.2079 of 2016**

1. Babulal son of Bhagat Ram Bande, aged about 55 years,
2. Ramswarup son of Barru Dhritlahre, aged about 38 years,
3. Jitendra Kumar son of Jodhiram Baghel, aged about 22 years,
4. Kamal Kumar son of Dayaram Banjare, aged about 23 years,

All are R/o Village Barda, Chowki Lawan, P.S. Kasdol, District
Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---Applicants

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through: Station House Officer, Police Station–
Kotwali, Balodabazar, District-Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---Non-applicant

For Applicants	:	Mr. Raghvendra Pradhan, Advocate
For Non-applicant	:	Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Dy.G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order on Board

20/04/2016

1. Since the aforesaid two bail applications are arising out of the same crime number, they are being disposed of by this common order.

2. These are the first bail applications filed under Section 439 of

the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the applicants who have been arrested in connection with Crime No.367/2015, registered at Police Station-Kotwali, District-Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara (CG), for the offence punishable under Sections 466, 467, 468, 472 and 474/34 of the IPC.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the present applicants were found making attempt to get the loan sanctioned on the basis of fake and forged documents.

4. Learned counsel for the applicants would submit that the applicants have not committed any offence and they have falsely been implicated in crime in question. He would further submit that they are simply villagers and forgery has been committed by co-accused Rajkumar @ Raju Sahu, the present applicants have not gained anything and charge-sheet has already been filed, therefore, they may be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the bail applications.

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

7. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the case, nature & gravity of the offence, role of the present applicants, their pre-trial detention, nature of offence and the fact that charge-sheet has already been filed, this Court is of the opinion that present is a fit case, in which, the applicants should be enlarged on regular bail.

8. Accordingly, the bail applications filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. are allowed.

9. It is directed that the applicants shall be released on bail on their furnishing a personal bond in the sum of **Rs.25,000/-** each with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, for their appearance as and when directed.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
JUDGE

B/-