

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1205 of 2016

- Lalit Kumar Sahu S/o Bhuwan Lal Sahu, Aged About 38 Years R/o Navdurga Nagar (Chourasiya Colony) Mathpuraina, Police Station - Tikrapara, Raipur Tahsil & District Raipur Chhattisgarh --- **Petitioner**

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh through the Station House Officer, Police Station - New Rajendra Nagar, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh --- **Respondent**

For the applicants : Mr. D. N. Prajapati, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Anupam Dubey, Dy. Govt. Adv.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

05.01.2017

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No. 12/2016 registered at Police Station New Rajendra Nagar, Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G) for the offence punishable under sections 420 & 120 of IPC and Sections 3 & 4 of the Price Chits & Money Circulation Banning Act, 1978 and Section 10 of the Chhattisgarh Nikshepakon Ka Sanrakshan Adhiniyam, 2005.
2. As per the prosecution case, a report was lodged by Krishna Kumar Sahu and others that they have invested the amounts in Ever Light Realcon Infrastructure Limited Company and they were allured by the present applicant. The allegation against the present applicant is that he has opened the office at Raipur on behalf of the Company and convinced the persons to deposit the money. Thereafter certain amounts were deposited on

the assurance that the amounts will be returned with high returns. Thereafter, after collecting the amount from different persons the office of the Company was closed and all the responsible persons have fled away.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant was neither an agent nor director of the Company and he had also invested the amount and also requested the other persons to invest the money and thus no offence has been committed, therefore, he may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.
4. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail.
5. Perused the FIR made by different persons mainly the reports of Krishna Kumar Sahu and Satyanarayan Nishad. It appears that the applicant is alleged to have opened the office on behalf of the Company and convinced the complainants and other persons to invest the money.
6. Considering the nature of such allegations levelled against the present applicant as also the fact that the investigation is still going on, I am of the view that it is not a case where the anticipatory bail can be granted to the applicant. Accordingly, this application is rejected.

Sd/-

**GOUTAM BHADURI
JUDGE**