

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRC No. 6117 of 2017

Rashid Ladle Sahab Momin, S/o. Yashim Ladle Sahab Momin, Aged About 47 Years, R/o. House No.19 Jahangir Milkawali Colony, Behind Commissioner Office, Shahi Bag, Ahmedabad (wrongly mentioned as Ahmabad) Gujrat.

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Police Station City Kotwali, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. N Naha Roy, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr. Gary Mukhopadhyay, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

27.09.2017

1. This is the fourth bail application filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.238/2016 registered at Police Station- City Kotwali Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420, 467, 468, 471 & 511 of Indian Penal Code. The first bail application was dismissed on 06.12.2016, second bail application was dismissed on 07.07.2017 and third bail application was dismissed on 01.09.2017.
2. As per the prosecution case, a report was made by Nagendra Tiwari of Ashutosh Engineering Industries that he is having an Account in SBI Commercial Branch have received a phone call from the Bank that they have issued a cheque of Rs.99,99,800/- in favour of one Vijay Bhai, which was denied. Subsequently, a report was made and it was revealed that the said cheque was

deposited at Ahmadabad and the present applicant has handed over the cheque which was forged.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant, by way of this fourth bail application, prays temporary bail of the applicant for the period of 30 days.
4. It appears that on the earlier occasion also on 01.09.2017 similar nature of bail was prayed for wherein the report of the Doctor was called and it was reported that no significant abnormality was seen with respect to the eye-test of the applicant and therefore, in view of that, the temporary bail which was claimed by the applicant was dismissed. Again the similar ground is being projected stating that certain documents were not on record at that time.
5. Perused the earlier order dated 01.09.2017 passed in third bail application. It appears that efforts are being made to avail the benefit of bail on some reason or the other. Taking into totality of the fact, I am not inclined to entertain the instant fourth bail application.
6. Accordingly, the fourth bail application filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge