

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 2688 of 2017**

1. Ravan Sai S/o Ratan Sai, Aged about 60 Years, Occupation- Labor;
2. Fagmaniya W/o Ravan Sai, Aged about 55 Years, Occupation Housewife,
Both R/o Village Shivpur, Police Station & Tahsil Batouli, District Surguja,
(Chhattisgarh).

---- Applicants**Versus**

- State of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Lundra, District- Surguja
(Chhattisgarh).

----Non-applicant

For Applicants	:-	Shri V.K. Pandey, Advocate.
For the State/Respondent	:-	Shri Neeraj Sharma, Panel Lawyer

SB: Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant**Order on Board****30-05-2017**

1. Heard on application under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 filed by the applicants for releasing them on regular bail.
2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicants that the applicants have been arrested in connection with Crime No.13/2017, registered at Police Station Lundra, District Surguja (C.G.) for offence punishable under Sections 363,366,366 (A), 376(2)(i) and 109 of the IPC and under Sections 5 (I), 6 & 17 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 on 06-03-2017. It is also submitted that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the case. The case was investigated and charge-sheet has been filed. Before the trial Court the case is likely to take some time for its disposal. The applicants are local residents of District Surguja. Hence, the applicants may be enlarged on bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application.
4. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary of Crime No.13/2017 of Police Station Lundra, District Surguja.
5. As per the contents of the case diary, main accused Sushil Paikra eloped with minor girl prosecutrix on 05-07-2016. During the period of elopement, applicant and prosecutrix resided in the house of these applicants. Later on, prosecutrix was left on her own and when Sushil Paikra refused to marry her, a report has been lodged on 15-02-2017.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the role of the applicants and the statement given by the prosecutrix under Section 164 of Cr.P.C., it is a fit case where the applicants should be enlarged on bail.
7. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. is allowed. It is directed that the applicants be released on bail on each of them furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Court for their appearance as and when directed.

Sd/-
(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Vacation Judge