

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURM.Cr.C.(A) No.896 of 2017

Shrawan Kumar Sahu S/o Shri Jodhiram Sahu, aged 43 years, R/o village Kunda, Tah Pandariya, District Kabirdham (C.G.).

---Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, Through P.S. Kunda, District Kabirdham (C.G.)

---Respondent

For applicant	:	Shri Devershi Thakur, Advocate
For respondent/State	:	Shri Gary Mukhopadhyay, Dy.G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam KoshyOrder on Board

29/11/2017

1. The applicant has filed this application for grant of anticipatory bail as he is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.185 of 2017 registered at Police Station Kunda, District Kabirdham (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420/34 IPC.
2. The allegation against the present applicant as per the prosecution case is that, the present applicant is said to have on the pretext of getting double returns on the investment of money being made have accepted huge amount of investment from the villagers and subsequently when the complainant side went for the returns of the money, it was refused and abuses and threat was given by the present applicant.
3. The counsel for the applicant submits that, the present applicant is not involved in the commission of any offence and that the present applicant

himself is a victim of the company in which the complainant have invested the money. He further submits that, it is a case where the present applicant himself lodged the complain against the complainant side also of having inducted in the business by the complainant-Kapil Chandrakar and thus for all these facts, the counsel for the applicant prayed for providing Anticipatory Bail to the applicant.

4. The State counsel however opposing the bail application submits that, it is a case where there are the statement of the complainant who have stated that it was the present applicant to whom the money was given and it was the present applicant who had assured them of the money getting double in around 6 years time and in the process collects huge amount of money.

5. Given the allegation levelled against the present applicant as is available from the case diary, this Court is not inclined to grant Anticipatory Bail to the present applicant at this juncture.

6. Accordingly, the bail application stands rejected.

Sumit

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE