

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 175 of 2018

- Tanuj Singh S/o Late Lokpal Singh Aged About 32 Years R/o. Village Kotgodi (Chhuhiyapara), Police Station And Tahsil Sonhat, District-Korea (C.G.), District : Koriya (Baikunthpur), Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Station House Officer, Police Of Police Station- Sonhat, District-Korea (C.G.), District : Koriya (Baikunthpur), Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. Anil Gulati, Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr. V.B. Singh, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant
Order On Board

26/04/2018

1. The applicant has preferred this bail application under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.14/2018 registered at Police Station- Sonhat, District – Korea(C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 294, 506, 354(क)(1) & 354(ख) of the Indian Penal Code.
2. Learned counsel for applicant submits that applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted that there had an incident of some scuffle between the applicant side and the complainant side because of which wife of this applicant had lodged a complaint in police-station-Sonhat, District-Korea, on which a report under Section 155 of CrPC was given that no offence is made out and

the party was directed to approach the Court having jurisdiction whereas the FIR was lodged on the same day. Later on, making various allegations against this applicant which itself shows that the FIR is premeditated and concocted, hence, it is prayed that he may be released on regular bail.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail application and the submissions made in this respect. It is submitted that according to the contents of the FIR and statement under Sections 161 & 164 of CrPC there are allegations against this applicant about abusing, threatening and outraging modesty of the victim in this case and apart from that this applicant has also a criminal history, hence, he is not entitled for grant of bail.
4. Heard both the parties and perused the case diary.
5. The fact of intimation given by wife of this applicant may be a piece of evidence which may be used in defence of this applicant in the trial. For the present looking to the evidence that is present against this applicant in the investigation, I am of this view that no case is made out for grant of bail.
6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is rejected.

Sd/-
(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge