

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC (A) No. 93 of 2017**

1. Jai Kumar Shukla S/o Shri Ram Aanchal Shukla Aged About 36 Years
2. Suraj Kumar Shukla, S/o Shri Ram Aanchal Shukla, Aged About 22 Years

Both R/o Bhawaniganj, Post Office Meghamau, Police Station Kumarganj, District Faijabad, Uttar Pradesh.

-----Applicants

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Tendukona, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Shri Rishi Rahul Soni, Advocate.
For Respondent	:	Shri UKS Chandel, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order On Board

18/05/2017

1. The applicant has filed this application for grant of anticipatory bail as he is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 177 of 2015 registered at Police Station, Tendukona, Distt. Mahasamund, for the offence punishable under Section 420/34 IPC
2. The allegation against the applicants, as per prosecution is that, the applicants in connivance with other accused persons is said to have cheated two persons namely Om Prakash and Tarun Kumar and on the pretext of getting them government employment collected Rs.1,25,000/- and Rs.1,45,000/- from Som Prakash and Tarun Kumar respectively. Subsequently, when the employment could not be provided, a report has been lodged. There are five accused persons including the applicants.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the applicants submits that the

applicants are also the victim of other accused persons who is said to have taken money from the applicants on the assurance of getting employment, but when the present applicants objected, the money has been deposited in their account.

4. The State counsel opposing the bail application submits that the allegation against the applicants are of serious in nature. The collection made by the other co-accused persons was infact credited in the account of present applicants and as such infact they are the main person who has received the entire amount collected from the complainants. He further submits that infact the payment have been made directly by the complainants in their account. It is not a case where the amount has been deposited by the other accused persons in the account of applicants.
5. Thus, taking into consideration the nature of allegation and specific role attributed by the applicants, this court is of the opinion that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the applicants. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge