

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Misc. Criminal Case No.1963 of 2017**

- Krishna Rajput S/o Munna Lal Rajput, Aged About 26 Years R/o Village Ghardihjona, Tahsil Rajakheda, District Dhoulpur (Rajasthan), Present R/o Sighanpur, Police Station Kosir, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Dabhra, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Shri Manoj Paranjpe and Shri Anurag Singh, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Shri Sumit Jhavar, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Chandra Bhushan Bajpai**Order On Board****18.7.2017**

Heard the matter finally.

2. This is an application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.302/2015 registered in Police Station Dabhara, Janjgir-Champa (CG) for the offence punishable under Section 395/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been arrested on 26.11.2015, after investigation, concerned police has filed charge sheet which is pending before Second Additional Sessions Judge, Sakti Distt. Janjgir-Champa, as Session Trial No.10/2016. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that there are total seven accused persons against

whom the charge sheet has been filed, co-accused Sunil Vishwakarma had filed M.Cr.C. No.410/16 & 3051/17 and both were rejected by this Court, co-accused Khemraj has preferred M.Cr.C. No.1734/2016 which was also dismissed by this Court, co-accused Prashant Bharadwaj also preferred M.Cr.C. No.1488/2016 which was also dismissed by this Court and two co-accused persons Ramu Rajput and Somu Rajput are still absconding, the trial Court had issued permanent non bailable warrant of arrest against them. From the applicant motor cycle bearing no any registration number has been seized on the basis of disclosure statement of the applicant. The said motor cycle belongs to complainant Shuklamber Sahu. The seizure affected prior to the arrest of the present applicant. Hence, looking to the facts, the applicant may be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the State opposed the arguments advanced on behalf of the applicant.

5. Perused the entire material.

6. On due consideration of the evidence collected against the present applicant and the nature of offence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the applicant.

7. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
(Chandra Bhushan Bajpai)
JUDGE