

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

M.CR.C.(A) No. 1287 of 2015

1. Akash Agarwal @ Tillu, S/o. Mahaveer Prasad Agrawal, aged about 29 years, R/o. Mayapur, Ambikapur, P.S. & Tahsil - Ambikapur, Civil and Revenue District – Sarguja (C.G.)

----Applicant

Versus

1. The State of Chhattisgarh, through : P.S. - Ajak, Surajpur, District – Surajpur (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr. Shakti Raj Sinha, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Mr. Anupam Dubey, Dy.Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

07/01/2016

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.169/2015 registered at Police Station- Ajak, Surajpur, District – Surajpur (C.G.), for offence punishable under Section 420, 467, 468/34 of I.P.C. and Section 3 (2) (5) of S.T. & S.C. (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, the applicant has preferred this application for grant of anticipatory bail.
2. As per the prosecution case, the applicant, who is working as property dealer showed land bearing Kh.No.15 area 3.77 hectare of Raju Rajwade to the complainant Lucilutia and entered into an agreement for sale of Rs.5.00 Lakhs and though the land belonged to Raju Rajwade instead of him, Heera Sai was personified as Raju Rajwade and agreement was executed, wherein, the applicant attested the seller, Heerasai as Raju Rajwade.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that, the applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. He would further submit that the complainant, who is the teacher in the Adult Education has reported so many cases like in nature. It is submitted that seven agreements like nature were executed and thereafter report was made to blackmail the person. Therefore, the counsel submit that the applicant may be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.
4. Per contra, the learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail .
5. Perused the case diary and the statement of Raju Rajwade, wherein it is stated that the land belonged to him was agreed to be sold by Heerasai, wherein the applicant has signed as witness. Considering the role played by this applicant, it can not be stated that custodial interrogation of the applicant may not be required. Therefore, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.
6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge