

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRC No. 5180 of 2016

- Ullas Nagpure @ Tinku Nagpure S/o Sharan Nagpure Aged About 38 Years R/o Laxmi Niwas New Shanti Nagar, Police Station - Civil Line, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh --- **Petitioner**

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh through - Station House Officer, Police Station - Khamtarai, District Raipur Chhattisgarh --- **Respondent**

For the applicant	:	Mr. Sandeep Yadav, Advocate
For the Respondent	:	Mr. Anupam Dubey, Dy.Govt. Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

17.10.2016

1. This is first bail application filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking grant of regular bail to the applicant in connection with Crime No. 252/2014 registered at P.S. Khamtarai, Distt. Raipur (C.G) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, 409, 201 of IPC.
2. As per the prosecution case, the applicant was working as an RTO Agent and in the year 2014 certain challans of Rs.425/- each were deposited in respect of four trucks and in the *e-challan* Rs.425/- was shown to be Rs.4250/- and also the applicant fabricated the *e-challans* and deposited the tax for 79 vehicles and further as many as 5014 forged e-challans were deposited and the tax amount which was paid was found to be different from that of e-challan.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant has been falsely implicated and there is no evidence on record to implicate the present applicant in

crime and only the forged e-challans are alleged to have been produced by the present applicant whereby loss of Rs.15,300/- was shown to be caused and since the said amount has been reimbursed by the respective truck owners therefore no loss has been caused to the State ex-chequer. He further submits that the charge sheet in this case has been filed and no further investigation is necessary, therefore, the applicant may be enlarged on bail.

4. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposes the bail.
5. Perused the case diary documents. Prima facie, it appears that the applicant by using forged e-challans has paid tax for different vehicles whereas higher tax was shown to be paid which came to notice after the amount was verified by the concerned clerk.
6. A perusal of the reply filed by the State also shows that certain notices were issued to the RTO requiring information, however, the office of the RTO has not cooperated in this matter.
7. Considering the seriousness and the facts situation of this case, I am not inclined to allow this application. Accordingly, it is rejected.

Sd/-

**GOUTAM BHADURI
JUDGE**