

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRC No. 8009 of 2016

1. Bhagirathi Nag S/o Bhanuram Nag Aged About 29 Years R/o Village Harrahpada, Police Station Keshkal, District Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh.
2. Gokaran Yadav S/o Ram Kumar Yadav Aged About 21 Years R/o Barpara, Main Road, Keshkal, Police Station Keshkal, District Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh.
3. Laxmi Narayan Nishad S/o Johan Nishad Aged About 19 Years R/o Barpara, Main Road, Keshkal, Police Station Keshkal, District Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh.
4. Monu Mandavi S/o Bahadur Mandavi Aged About 22 Years R/o Borgaon, Police Station Keshkal, District Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh.
5. Tikesh Yadav S/o Sudersan Yadav Aged About 21 Years R/o Borgaon, Police Station Keshkal, District Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicants

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through: The Police Station Keshkal, District-Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicants	:	Shri Vishnu Koshta and Shri Shobhit Koshta, Advocates
For State	:	Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer

S.B. Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

15/12/2016

Heard.

1. The applicants have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 122 of 2016 registered in Police Station- Keshkal, District- Kondagaon (C.G.) for the alleged commission of offence under Sections 363, 354, 506, 511 read with Section 34 IPC and Section 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.
2. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that in the night, three of the five accused persons took the two girls, minor in age, tying their faces and eyes with an

attempt to outrage their modesty and thereafter the two girls escaped and report was lodged.

3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the allegation is highly improbable. It is submitted that the girls had gone along with the applicants but later on they have falsely alleged on the pressure exerted upon them by some other persons. It is next contended that the allegation that the two girls were taken away is only against two applicants, therefore, other may be granted bail.
4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State has opposed the bail application.
5. Taking into consideration the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the nature of allegation against the applicants as stated in the statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. of the minor girls, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicants at this stage. However, if there is delay in trial, the applicants would be at liberty to revive the application.
6. The application is accordingly dismissed with the observation as above.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge