

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Cr.M.P.No.658 of 2017**

Ravishanker Sahu S/o. Late Shri Dhaneshwar Sahu, aged about 45 years, R/o. Village-Hasuwa, Thana-Gidhouri, Tahsil-Kashdol, Civil & Revenue Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, through, District Magistrate, Balodabazar, Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Respondent

Cr.M.P.No.659 of 2017

Ravishanker Sahu S/o. Late Shri Dhaneshwar Sahu, aged about 45 years, R/o. Village-Hasuwa, Thana-Gidhouri, Tahsil-Kashdol, Civil & Revenue Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, through, District Magistrate, Balodabazar, Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Respondent

Cr.M.P.No.660 of 2017

Ravishanker Sahu S/o. Late Shri Dhaneshwar Sahu, aged about 45 years, R/o. Village-Hasuwa, Thana-Gidhouri, Tahsil-Kashdol, Civil & Revenue Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, through, District Magistrate, Balodabazar, Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Respondent

Cr.M.P.No.662 of 2017

Ravishanker Sahu S/o. Late Shri Dhaneshwar Sahu, aged about 45 years, R/o. Village-Hasuwa, Thana-Gidhouri, Tahsil-Kashdol, Civil & Revenue Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, through, District Magistrate,
Balodabazar, Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Respondent

Cr.M.P.No.675 of 2017

Ravishanker Sahu S/o. Late Shri Dhaneshwar Sahu, aged
about 45 years, R/o. Village-Hasuwa, Thana-Gidhour, Tahsil-
Kashdol, Civil & Revenue Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara
(CG)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, through, District Magistrate,
Balodabazar, Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Respondent

Cr.M.P.No.676 of 2017

Ravishanker Sahu S/o. Late Shri Dhaneshwar Sahu, aged
about 45 years, R/o. Village-Hasuwa, Thana-Gidhour, Tahsil-
Kashdol, Civil & Revenue Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara
(CG)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, through, District Magistrate,
Balodabazar, Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Respondent

And

Cr.M.P.No.677 of 2017

Ravishanker Sahu S/o. Late Shri Dhaneshwar Sahu, aged
about 45 years, R/o. Village-Hasuwa, Thana-Gidhour, Tahsil-
Kashdol, Civil & Revenue Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara
(CG)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, through, District Magistrate,
Balodabazar, Distt.-Balodabazar-Bhatapara (CG)

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr.Sunil Sahu, Advocate
For Respondent	: Mr.P.K.Bhaduri & Mr.Shashank Thakur, G.A., Mr.Vinod Deshmukh & Mr.Gary Mukhopadhyay, Dy.G.A. and Mr.Bhaskar Payasi and Mr.Majid Ali, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order on Board

19/06/2016

1. The applicant is facing trial for offence under Sections 407/34 & 420/34 of the IPC and Section 3/7 of the Essential Commodities Act, in which charges have been framed against him on 3.10.2015, but within one year only 4-5 witnesses have been examined, therefore, the applicant preferred an application under Section 437(6) of the CrPC for grant of bail which has been rejected by the trial Court and affirmed by the revisional Court in the impugned orders, against which, the applicant has preferred the aforesaid petitions under Section 482 of the CrPC.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the orders passed by the trial Court rejecting his applications and affirmed by the revisional Court suffers from jurisdictional error as well as perversity, therefore, the impugned orders are liable to be dismissed.

3. On the other hand, learned State Counsel would oppose these petitions.

4. The trial Court has recorded the finding that some of listed witnesses have been examined and the prosecution is taking prompt steps to get the prosecution witnesses examined on the

date fixed and there is serious allegation against the applicant as he is said to have been embezzled the governmental money.

5. Sufficient reasons have been assigned by the revisional Court for upholding the orders of the trial Court as material witnesses have been examined and offence against the present applicant is serious in nature. The orders passed by the trial Court as affirmed by the revisional Court are discriminatory in nature. There is no illegality or perversity in the impugned orders.

6. Accordingly, the petitions are liable to be and are hereby dismissed. However, this order will not prevent the trial Court to do well and conclude the proceedings expeditiously.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K Agrawal)
Judge

B/-