

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

M.Cr.C.(A) No. 987 /2016

Kishan Tandon Kranti, S/o. R.K. Tandon, Aged About 52 Years, R/o. Village Masturi, Police Station- Masturi, District Bilaspur. At Present Address Deputy Director, Directorate, Women & Child Development, Indravati Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh, Through the Incharge, State Economic Offence Investigation Bureau, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (Thana Anti Corruption Bureau Raipur).

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. J.K.Saxena, Advocate.
For Respondent : Mr. Anil S. Pandey, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

27/10/2016

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.36/2015 registered at Police Station- Anti Corruption Bureau, Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 13(1)(e), 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, the applicant has preferred this application under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail.
2. As per the prosecution case, the applicant who was working in the office of Women & Child Development during his service has procured more than his income to the extent of 100% and the property more than worth Rs.10 Crores were earned; thereby the offence has been committed.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant has been falsely implicated, as the applicant has property in the name of his wife, two sons and daughter-in-law and all they are working and earning and all the income earned from time to time were informed to the Government and no additional amount was found. He further submits that false allegations have been

attributed to the applicant, therefore, he may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and would submit that still the investigation is going on.
5. Perused the case diary and the inventory prepared by the Anti Corruption Bureau. Prima facie, it reflects that the applicant has procured huge properties mainly immovable, for which an investigation is still going on as number of properties are shown in the name of applicant including his family members i.e. sons, daughter-in-law etc. Taking into such documents, this is not a case where the benefit of Section 438 of Cr.P.C. can be extended to the applicant.
6. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge